Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

(1)

No. 02 1580

APR 25 2003

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

RICHARD VIETH, *et al.*,
Appellants,

v.

ROBERT C. JUBELIRER AND JOHN M. PERZEL, *et al.*,
Appellees.

On Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania

---

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

ROBERT B. HOFFMAN
REED SMITH LLP
P.O. Box 11844
Harrisburg, PA 17108
(717) 257-3042

PAUL M. SMITH
Counsel of Record
THOMAS J. PERRELLI
BRUCE V. SPIVA
SAM HIRSCH
DANIEL MACH
JENNER & BLOCK, LLC
601 Thirteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 639-6000

Counsel for Appellants

WILSON-EPES PRINTING CO., INC. – (202) 789-0096 – WASHINGTON, D. C. 20001

ADM PP
$ 1/0

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the District Court erred in effectively concluding that voters affiliated with a major political party may never state a claim of unconstitutional partisan gerrymandering, thereby nullifying this Court's decision in *Davis v. Bandemer*, 478 U.S. 109 (1986).

2. Whether a State presumptively violates the Equal Protection Clause when it subordinates all traditional, neutral districting principles to the overarching goal of drawing a congressional redistricting map that achieves maximum partisan advantage for members of one political party.

3. Whether a State exceeds its delegated power under Article I of the Constitution when it draws congressional-district boundaries to ensure that candidates from one political party will consistently capture a supermajority of the State's congressional seats even if those candidates win less than half the popular vote statewide.

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

Appellants are Richard Vieth, Norma Jean Vieth, and Susan Furey. Appellees are Robert C. Jubelirer, President of the Pennsylvania Senate; John M. Perzel, Speaker of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives; Edward G. Rendell, Governor of Pennsylvania; Catherine Baker Knoll, Lieutenant Governor of Pennsylvania; Pedro A. Cortes, Acting Secretary of the Commonwealth; and Monna J. Accurti, Commissioner of the Bureau of Commissions, Elections, and Legislation of the Pennsylvania Department of State.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED i

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING ii

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES vi

OPINIONS BELOW 1

JURISDICTION 1

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED 1

STATEMENT OF THE CASE 1

THE QUESTIONS PRESENTED ARE SUBSTANTIAL 11

I. THE DISTRICT COURT MISREAD *BANDEMER* 14

A. Appellants Stated a Valid Claim Under *Bandemer* 15

B. The District Court's Construction of *Bandemer* Would Effectively Overrule It. 17

II. UNDER THIS COURT'S *SHAW V. RENO* LINE OF CASES, ACT 34 UNCONSTITUITIONALLY SUBORDINATED NEUTRAL DISTRICTING PRINCIPLES TO RANK PARTISANSHIP 22

III. THE PENNSYLVANIA GENERAL ASSEMBLY EXCEEDED ITS LIMITED AUTHORITY TO REGULATE FEDERAL ELECTION PROCEDURES UNDER ARTICLE I 25

CONCLUSION 30

APPENDIX A

Vieth v. Pennsylvania, Order and Opinion, 241 F. Supp. 2d 478 (M.D. Pa. 2003) 1a

APPENDIX B

Vieth v. Pennsylvania, Order and Opinion, 188 F. Supp. 2d 532 (M.D. Pa. 2002) 13a

APPENDIX C

Vieth v. Pennsylvania, Order and Opinion, 195 F. Supp. 2d 672 (Md. Pa. 2002) 46a

APPENDIX D

Erfer v. Commonwealth, Opinion, 794 A.2d 325 (Pa. 2002) 63a

APPENDIX E

Notice of Appeal 126a

APPENDIX F

Amended Complaint 128a

APPENDIX G

Affidavit of Robert Priest, filed with Plaintiffs' Motion to Impose Remedial Districts, April 22, 2002 ..... 148a

APPENDIX H

U.S. Congressional Districts – Act 34 ..... 164a

APPENDIX I

U.S. Congressional Districts – Southeast – Act 34 ..... 165a

APPENDIX J

U.S. Congressional Districts – Southwest – Act 34 ..... 166a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES **Page**

Anne Arundel County Republican Central Committee v. State Administrative Board of Election Laws, 781 F. Supp. 394 (D. Md. 1991), *summarily aff'd*, 504 U.S. 938 (1992) 18, 29

Badham v. Eu, 694 F. Supp. 664 (N.D. Cal. 1988), *summarily aff'd*, 488 U.S. 1024 (1989) 7, 17, 19

Brown v. Thomson, 462 U.S. 835 (1983) 29

Cook v. Gralike, 531 U.S. 510 (2001) 14, 26, 28, 30

Davis v. Bandemer, 478 U.S. 109 (1986) ..... *passim*

Easley v. Cromartie, 532 U.S. 234 (2001) 24

Elrod v. Burns, 427 U.S. 347 (1976) 24

Fund for Accurate & Informed Representation, Inc. v. Weprin, 796 F. Supp. 662 (N.D.N.Y.), *summarily aff'd*, 507 U.S. 956 (1993) 18

Holloway v. Hechler, 817 F. Supp. 617 (S.D.W. Va. 1992), *summarily aff'd*, 507 U.S. 956 (1993) 18

Hunt v. Cromartie, 526 U.S. 541 (1999) 24

Karcher v. Daggett, 462 U.S. 725 (1983) 8, 11, 29

Mandel v. Bradley, 432 U.S. 173 (1977) 18

Martinez v. Bush, 234 F. Supp. 2d 1275 (S.D. Fla. 2002) 2

Miller v. Johnson, 515 U.S. 900 (1995) 13, 23, 25

O'Hare Truck Service, Inc. v. City of Northlake, 518 U.S. 712 (1996) 24

O'Lear v. Miller, 222 F. Supp. 2d 850 (E.D. Mich.), *summarily aff'd*, 123 S. Ct. 512 (2002) 20

Police Department v. Mosley, 408 U.S. 92 (1972) 24

Pope v. Blue, 809 F. Supp. 392 (W.D.N.C.), *summarily aff'd*, 506 U.S. 801 (1992) 18, 19

Republican Party v. Martin, 980 F.2d 943 (4th Cir. 1992) 20, 21

Shaw v. Reno, 509 U.S. 630 (1993) 13, 22, 23, 24, 25

Smiley v. Holm, 285 U.S. 355 (1932) 28

Terrazas v. Slagle, 821 F. Supp. 1162 (W.D. Tex. 1993) 20

U.S. Term Limits, Inc. v. Thornton, 514 U.S. 779 (1995) 14, 26, 27, 28, 29

Wells v. Rockefeller, 394 U.S. 542 (1969) 12

Wesberry v. Sanders, 376 U.S. 1 (1964) 26

White v. Alabama, 867 F. Supp. 1571 (M.D. Ala. 1994) 20

Williams v. Rhodes, 393 U.S. 23 (1968) 24

CONSTITUTION AND STATUTES

U.S. Const. art. I, § 2 ..... 1, 26

U.S. Const. art. I, § 4, cl. 1 ..... 1, 27

U.S. Const. amend. XIV, § 1 1

28 U.S.C. § 1253 1

28 U.S.C. § 2101(b) 1

42 U.S.C. § 1973 23

42 U.S.C. § 1973c 23

MISCELLANEOUS

1 *Annals of Congress* (Ames) 28

Editorial, *Democracy Denied*, Richmond Times-Dispatch, Mar. 17, 2002 13

Juliet Eilperin, *House Democrats' Climb Gets Steeper: Party Lacks Rallying Cry as Redistricting, Incumbency Cut Competitive Races*, Wash. Post, Apr. 2, 2002 13

2 *Elliot's Debates* (Parsons) 27, 28

John Hart Ely, *Gerrymanders: The Good, The Bad, and the Ugly*, 50 STAN. L. REV. 607 (1998) 2

Gregory M. Harvey, *Redistricting Plan Draws the Line Between Equal and Fair*, Legal Intelligencer, May 20, 2002 4

Samuel Issacharoff, *Gerrymandering and Political Cartels*, 116 HARV. L. REV. 593 (2002) 2

Daniel H. Lowenstein & Richard L. Hasen, *Election Law Cases and Materials* (2d ed. 2002 Update) 22

Michael W. McConnell, *The Redistricting Cases: Original Mistakes and Current Consequences*, 24 HARV. J.L. & PUB. POL'Y 103 (2000) 26

Alison Mitchell, *Redistricting 2002 Produces No Great Shake-Ups*, N.Y. Times, Mar. 13, 2002 13

Pa. Dep't of State, Commissions, Elections & Legislations, Official 2002 General Election Results, Representative in Congress *at* http://web.dos.state.pa.us/elections/elec results/dsf/district3.cgi?office=USC&eyear =2002&etype=G 10

RICHARD A. Posner, LAW, PRAGMATISM, AND DEMOCRACY (2003) 2, 3

2 *Records of the Federal Convention* 27

OPINIONS BELOW

The District Court's opinion and order are reported at 241 F. Supp. 2d 478 and reprinted at J.S. App. 1a-12a. An earlier opinion addressing standards for partisan gerrymandering in more detail is reported at 188 F. Supp. 2d 532 and reprinted at J.S. App. 13a-45a.

JURISDICTION

The three-judge District Court's final opinion and order dismissing Appellants' claims for injunctive relief from an alleged partisan gerrymander were entered on January 24, 2003. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2101(b), the notice of appeal was timely filed on February 24, 2003. J.S. App. 126a-127a. This Court's jurisdiction is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1253.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED

The Equal Protection Clause of Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides: "No State shall . . . deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." Section 2 of Article I of the Constitution provides in part: "The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States . . . ." The Elections Clause of Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution provides: "The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Places of chusing Senators."

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Jurists running the gamut from Seventh Circuit Judge Richard A. Posner to District Judge Adalberto Jordan of the Southern District of Florida have recently joined the chorus

of commentators[1] asking this Court to revisit the issues it last addressed nearly two decades ago in *Davis v. Bandemer*, 478 U.S. 109 (1986). The *Bandemer* Court held that partisan-gerrymandering claims were justiciable. But as Judge Jordan explained, since then the "lower courts [have] continue[d] to struggle in an attempt to interpret and apply the 'discriminatory effect' prong of the [*Bandemer*] standard." *Martinez v. Bush*, 234 F. Supp. 2d 1275, 1352 (S.D. Fla. 2002) (three-judge court) (concurring opinion). Citing this Pennsylvania case, Judge Jordan complained that "'the recondite standard enunciated in *Bandemer* offers little concrete guidance.'" *Id.* (quoting *Vieth v. Pennsylvania*, 188 F. Supp. 2d 532, 544 (M.D. Pa. 2002) (three-judge court), J.S. App. 33a-34a). Judge Jordan therefore urged this Court "to note probable jurisdiction in . . . one of the . . . political gerrymandering cases arising from this electoral cycle and hear oral argument." *Id.* at 1353.

Similarly, Judge Posner has now called on federal courts to give "careful judicial scrutiny" to gerrymandering that "entrench[es] incumbents or dominant [political] parties." RICHARD A. POSNER, LAW, PRAGMATISM, AND DEMOCRACY 242 (2003). Judge Posner explains that "judicial insouciance" toward partisan gerrymanders "designed to create 'safe' seats for the party that controls the legislature" has undermined "electoral competition, the lifeblood of democracy." *Id.* at 244-45. Courts and constitutional scholars alike, he argues, pay too "little attention to partisan gerrymandering in comparison to the attention they lavish on malapportionment [*i.e.*, one-person, one-vote], campaign-finance reform, term limits, and racial gerrymandering." *Id.* at 244. "As a result, although partisan

[1] *See, e.g.*, Samuel Issacharoff, *Gerrymandering and Political Cartels*, 116 HARV. L. REV. 593, 597-98, 601-02 (2002); John Hart Ely, *Gerrymanders: The Good, The Bad, and the Ugly*, 50 STAN. L. REV. 607, 621 (1998).

gerrymandering is rife, the courts have done virtually nothing to control it." *Id.* at 245.

This case presents the Court with an ideal opportunity to clarify *Bandemer* and bring extreme partisan gerrymandering under control.

Appellants, who are Democratic voters from Pennsylvania, appeal the rejection by a three-judge Federal District Court of their claims that Pennsylvania's new congressional redistricting plan is so biased in favor of Republicans that it constitutes an unconstitutional partisan gerrymander. The ruling below is one of a series of lower-court decisions since *Davis v. Bandemer*, holding that it is not enough for plaintiffs to show that a districting map severely "packs" and "fractures" voters of one political party and thus disproportionately favors candidates of another party. Although far from consistent with one another, these decisions have all required plaintiffs to prove some harm in addition to the harm caused by a severely biased redistricting map – for example, proof that members of the disfavored political party are barred from organizing and campaigning for candidates, or a showing that the candidates of the party favored by the map, when elected, would completely ignore constituents aligned with the disfavored party. Such an approach means that partisan gerrymandering, while justiciable in theory, is immune from legal challenge in actual practice, no matter how extreme the bias that is introduced into a districting scheme. Recognizing that reality, lawmakers have "pushed the envelope" of partisan bias in the post-2000 round of redistricting, with Pennsylvania's map being just one of the most extreme. It is essential that this Court undertake plenary review in this case to make clear that the harms caused by partisan gerrymandering are not wholly beyond judicial redress.

Following the 2000 census, the size of Pennsylvania's congressional delegation shrunk from 21 members to 19.

Republican legislators, who constitute a majority in both houses of the Pennsylvania General Assembly, introduced and ultimately passed a map on January 3, 2002.[2] That map became known as Act 1 after the Governor signed it into law on January 7, 2002.

Act 1 was immediately controversial and received national attention as "the most partisan congressional gerrymander of this young century, and among the worst in the last several decades of the earlier millennium." Gregory M. Harvey, *Redistricting Plan Draws the Line Between Equal and Fair*, Legal Intelligencer, May 20, 2002, at 6. The map was designed to give Republicans a supermajority in the Commonwealth's congressional delegation, even if, as usually occurs, Republican candidates receive less than half of the vote for Congress statewide. Moreover, to achieve this extreme level of partisan bias, the plan's authors sacrificed every traditional districting principle – slashing through communities, splitting precincts, municipalities, and counties, and producing a map that can only be described as a contorted mess. *See* J.S. App. 54a-55a; 134a-137a.[3]

For example, one heavily Democratic portion of Montgomery County (located in the suburbs of Philadelphia) was extracted from relatively competitive District 13 and connected to heavily Republican District 8 by means of a several-mile-long, 400-foot-wide connecting isthmus. Similarly, the Pennsylvania Commonwealth Court described nearby District 6 as "an irregular, 'dragon-shaped' district that covers three counties in southeast Pennsylvania and includes several wholly distinct, unconnected communities

---

[2] Although the map was passed on a party-line vote in the Senate, its supporters were able to induce 42 Democrats to support it in the House.

[3] Maps of Act 34 – which, as discussed below, is the remedial redistricting plan challenged in this appeal, and which is nearly identical to Act 1 – are included in the appendix, J.S. App. 164a- 166a.

of interest." *Id.* 96a. Perhaps worst of all, intertwined Districts 12 and 18, which wander all over southwestern Pennsylvania, split 8 counties and 39 municipalities as they carefully separate Republican-leaning and Democratic-leaning neighborhoods along their jagged borders. Overall, the new map increased the number of county splits from 18 to 25 and the number of municipal splits from 13 to 59.

In addition, although Pennsylvania lost just two congressional seats, Act 1 "paired" six incumbents in three districts. In two cases, pairs of Democratic incumbents were matched against one another. In a third district, a Democratic incumbent was placed with a Republican in a district designed to favor the Republican.

On January 11, 2002, Appellants Richard Vieth, Norma Jean Vieth, and Susan Furey brought this action in federal court, raising two primary claims. First, Appellants claimed that Act 1 creates congressional districts of needlessly unequal population in violation of Article I, Section 2 of the U.S. Constitution. *Id.* 135a, 144a. Second, Appellants claimed that Act 1 was a political gerrymander that deprived Pennsylvania's Democratic voters of the rights guaranteed to them by the Equal Protection Clause, as well as Article I of the U.S. Constitution. *Id.* 137a-145a. In support of the latter claim, they pointed to the huge disparity between votes for Congress statewide (generally slightly favoring the Democrats) and electoral outcomes deliberately created by the mapmakers (a Republican advantage of at least 12-to-7 and perhaps 14-to-5). *Id.* 137a-138a. They also relied on the disparate pairing of incumbents and further alleged that the map would consistently frustrate the will of the political majority over the course of the next decade. *Id.* 139a-144a.

At approximately the same time, a different set of plaintiffs filed suit in state court, claiming that the partisan bias of the districting plan violated the Pennsylvania Constitution. The Pennsylvania Supreme Court directed the

Commonwealth Court to hold an expedited trial and to propose findings of fact and conclusions of law. The Commonwealth Court found that the plan enacted by the Pennsylvania General Assembly would produce a 14-to-5 or 13-to-6 Republican advantage in the State's congressional delegation, even if Republican candidates received less than half the popular vote. J.S. App. 94a. It also detailed the effects of incumbent pairings in the map as well as the ways that partisan ambition overrode traditional districting criteria as compactness and respect for communities of interest and municipal boundaries. *Id.* 94a-97a.

Ultimately, however, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court rejected the plaintiffs' state-law claims in a ruling that presaged the federal-court ruling now on appeal. Basing its analysis of state law on this Court's decision in *Bandemer*, the state court held that the plaintiffs' claims were deficient because they had not gone beyond proving "disproportionate results" and had not shown that Democrats would be "shut out of the political process." *Id.* 74a-77a.

Chief Justice Zappala dissented. He commented: "If the record of this case does not establish unconstitutional political gerrymandering, *no such claim exists*. This Court should not then waste its valuable judicial resources entertaining illusory claims that, in reality, can never be established." *Id.* 125a (emphasis added).

In the federal case, the three-judge District Court granted the Commonwealth's motion to dismiss Appellants' political-gerrymandering claims. The court examined those claims entirely within the framework set forth by the plurality opinion in *Bandemer*, never acknowledging (despite a motion for reconsideration) Appellants' separate Article I arguments. The court held that, to state an equal-protection claim of partisan gerrymandering, Appellants must "prove both intentional discrimination against an identifiable political group and an actual discriminatory effect on that

group." *Id.* 32a (quoting *Bandemer*, 478 U.S. at 127 (plurality opinion)). The court determined that Appellants satisfied the first two prongs of this test: namely, (1) that Appellants, and all Pennsylvania citizens who vote for Democrats, constitute an identifiable political group, and (2) that Appellants' allegations that the General Assembly Republicans "prevented all Democratic input on Act 1 in order to establish a Republican super-majority in Pennsylvania's congressional caucus" were sufficient to establish the Assembly's discriminatory intent. *Id.* 32a-33a.

The District Court held, however, that Appellants did not allege sufficient discriminatory effects to satisfy the third prong of the *Bandemer* test. The court held that the discriminatory-effects analysis itself involved another two-pronged showing: (1) that the challenged map would produce disproportionate election results, and (2) that "the electoral system is arranged in a manner that will consistently degrade a voter's, or group of voters', influence on the political process as a whole." *Id.* 33a (quoting *Bandemer*, 478 U.S. at 110 (plurality opinion)). Observing that *Bandemer* itself "offers little concrete guidance" with respect to this second prong, the District Court instead relied on *Badham v. Eu*, 694 F. Supp. 664 (N.D. Cal. 1988) (three-judge court), *summarily aff'd*, 488 U.S. 1024 (1989).

Adopting *Badham*'s interpretation of the second prong of the discriminatory-effects test, the District Court held that Appellants could not establish Act 1's actual discriminatory effects because they could not allege "facts indicating that as a result of Act 1 [they] will be completely shut out of the political process." J.S. App. 33a. More specifically, the court faulted Appellants for failing to allege "that anyone has ever prevented, or will ever prevent, Plaintiffs from: registering to vote; organizing with other like-minded voters; raising funds on behalf of candidates; voting; campaigning; or speaking out on matters of public concern." *Id.* 39a

(citing *Badham*, 694 F. Supp. at 670). Without such evidence of "impediments to . . . full participation in the 'uninhibited, robust, wide-open' public debate on which our political system relies," the District Court held that Appellants could not state an equal-protection claim of partisan gerrymandering. *Id.* (quoting *Badham*, 694 F. Supp. at 670). In other words, the court held that the severely biased map enacted by the Commonwealth would become unconstitutional only if it were accompanied by *entirely separate and independently unconstitutional* limitations on Democrats' ability to vote, campaign for candidates, and speak out about political issues.

Appellants' one-person, one-vote claim was not dismissed. After a two-day trial, the District Court ruled in favor of Appellants on that claim. J.S. App. 57a. At trial, Appellants demonstrated that Act 1's population deviation of 19 persons was not justified by *any* neutral, consistently applied redistricting policy. Instead, the deviation reflected Republican legislators' unwillingness to make even minor changes in a carefully calibrated map.

Based on this evidence, the District Court found that the nonpartisan justification for the 19-person population deviation offered by Appellees – minimizing split precincts – was a "mere pretext" and that the deviation therefore was not constitutionally justified under *Karcher v. Daggett*, 462 U.S. 725 (1983). J.S. App. 53a-54a. Specifically, the District Court found that, of all the maps introduced at trial, Act 1 contained the least compact districts and split the most counties and municipalities. *Id.* 54a-55a. The court also found that "[t]o the extent that Act 1 retains the cores of prior districts, it does so only for districts containing Republican incumbents." *Id.* 55a. And finally, the court found that Act 1 "failed most miserably" in terms of avoiding contests between incumbent Representatives: Although Pennsylvania's loss of two congressional seats

required the pairing of only two sets of incumbents in the 2002 elections, Act 1 gratuitously paired *three* sets of incumbents, in a manner favoring Republican candidates in each instance, while also creating an open seat favoring a Republican candidate. *Id.*

In its April 8, 2002 order invalidating Act 1, the District Court retained jurisdiction over the case pending the court's review and approval of a remedial redistricting plan. *Id.* 56a-57a. On April 18, 2002, then-Governor Schweiker signed into law Act No. 2002-34, 25 P.S. § 3595.301 ("Act 34"), a remedial plan enacted by the Pennsylvania General Assembly a day earlier.

As Appellants demonstrated in an April 22, 2002 brief challenging the constitutionality of Act 34, the new congressional districts in the remedial plan were nearly identical to the gerrymandered districts in Act 1. Act 34's districts mirrored the bizarre shapes of those in Act 1, as each of the new Act 34 districts retained at least 97.8% of the population of its Act 1 predecessor. J.S. App. 150a, 160a-163a. As with Act 1, the General Assembly disregarded all legitimate redistricting principles when passing Act 34, creating meandering, noncompact districts that split counties, municipalities, and communities of interest. *See id.* 164a-166a. In fact, the districts in Act 34 were slightly *less* compact than Act 1's districts. *Id.* 150a, 159a. And Act 34 further increased the number of political-subdivision splits, slicing 29 counties and 81 municipalities (up from 25 and 65, respectively, in Act 1). *Id.* 150a, 152a-158a.

On April 23, 2002, with the question of the sufficiency of the Act 34 remedy pending and the congressional primaries fast approaching, the District Court stayed its earlier decision and ordered Appellees to conduct the 2002 elections using Act 1. Meanwhile, Appellants appealed the District Court's dismissal of their partisan-gerrymandering challenge to Act 1. On October 7, 2002, this Court

dismissed that appeal as moot given that Act 34 by its terms repealed Act 1 for any election after 2002. *Vieth v. Jubelirer*, 123 S. Ct. 68 (2002).

The November 2002 general elections confirmed the extreme partisan bias of Act 1 (and, by extension, Act 34). All but one of the Republican incumbents won reelection by more than 14 percentage points. *See* Pa. Dep't of State, Commissions, Elections & Legislations, Official 2002 General Election Results, Representative in Congress *at* http://web.dos.state.pa.us/elections/elec_results/dsf/district3.cgi?office=USC&eyear=2002&etype=G.[4] In addition, a Republican won the newly created open seat in District 6. *See id.* Ultimately, Republicans gained a 12-to-7 advantage in the State's congressional delegation – a net loss of three Democratic incumbents. *See id.*

As the parties continued to litigate the remedial sufficiency of Act 34 in the District Court, Appellants reiterated their argument – previously rejected by the court with respect to Act 1 – that the map was an unlawful partisan gerrymander. On January 24, 2003, the District Court approved Act 34 as a remedy for the one-person, one-vote violation in Act 1. J.S. App. 12a. Yet the court also concluded that, other than avoiding population deviations among districts, Act 34 "jettisons every other neutral non-discriminatory redistricting criteri[on]." *Id.* 9a n.3. "Despite an opportunity to improve upon the numerous deficiencies of Act 1," the District Court explained, "Defendants have returned to this court with essentially the same map." *Id.* The court nonetheless rejected Appellants' partisan-gerrymandering claim, reiterating its earlier conclusion that

[4] Only George Gekas, the Republican incumbent running against Democratic incumbent Tim Holden in District 17, failed in his reelection bid. Holden won District 17 – a district comprising approximately 60% of the population of Gekas's former district – with only 51% of the vote.

"'Plaintiffs [did not] allege[] facts indicating that they have been shut out of the political process and, therefore, they cannot establish an actual discriminatory effect on them,' as required by *Davis v. Bandemer*." *Id.* 11a (quoting *Vieth*, 188 F. Supp. 2d at 547, J.S. App. 39a). This appeal followed.

THE QUESTIONS PRESENTED ARE SUBSTANTIAL

This Court held in *Davis v. Bandemer*, 478 U.S. 109, 118-27 (1986), that partisan gerrymandering claims are justiciable. That decision was a watershed. Prior to *Bandemer*, the only judicially enforced constitutional limit on political discrimination in redistricting was the one-person, one-vote mandate. But as Justice Harlan observed in 1969, the rule "of absolute [population] equality is perfectly compatible with 'gerrymandering' of the worst sort. A computer may grind out district lines which can totally frustrate the popular will on an overwhelming number of critical issues." *Wells v. Rockefeller*, 394 U.S. 542, 551 (1969) (dissenting opinion); *see also Karcher v. Daggett*, 462 U.S. 725, 776 (1983) (White, J., dissenting) ("There is now evidence that Justice Harlan was correct to predict that '[e]ven more than in the past, district lines are likely to be drawn to maximize the political advantage of the party temporarily dominant in public affairs.'") (citation omitted). By recognizing a limit to political discrimination in redistricting other than the rule of population equality, *Bandemer* promised to check partisan gerrymandering, which Justice White deemed "a far greater potential threat to equality of representation." *Karcher*, 462 U.S. at 776 (dissenting opinion) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted).

That promise, as the District Court's decision demonstrates, has yet to be realized. It is difficult to imagine a more egregious partisan gerrymander than Act 34, a map that jettisons all traditional, neutral districting principles so that one political party can win a supermajority of the State's

congressional seats even if it receives less than half of the popular vote. The degree of partisan skew in this case goes far beyond that of the map challenged in *Bandemer* itself. But despite this Court's clear indication in *Bandemer* that state legislatures may not consign political majorities to minority status, and despite Appellants' specific allegations that Act 34 would accomplish that goal, the District Court held that Appellants had failed to state a valid claim.

In so holding, the District Court relied not on *Bandemer* itself, but on the decision of the first lower court to apply *Bandemer* – *Badham v. Eu*, *supra*. The *Badham* district court enunciated a test for unconstitutional partisan gerrymandering that clearly conflicts with *Bandemer*. Application of that test renders it impossible for voters affiliated with a major political party to state a political-gerrymandering claim, because it requires them to demonstrate *not only* severe bias in a districting map *but also* exclusion from any opportunity to participate in the political process through voting, organizing, and campaigning for office. Under that early misinterpretation of *Bandemer*, which has come to be very influential among lower courts, every claim of political gerrymandering – with one exception, *see infra* pages 20-21 – has failed.

But there has never been a clearer need for some enforceable limit on the ability of legislators to dilute the voting power of a class of citizens based on their political viewpoint. In the 17 years since this Court decided *Bandemer*, advances in political data-gathering and computer technology have made it increasingly easy for legislatures to gerrymander with surgical precision, excising and shifting just a few politically undesirable voters at a time. As a result, in the current round of redistricting, legislators in a number of key States, including Pennsylvania, Florida, and Michigan, have drawn congressional district maps with remarkable levels of partisan bias. In so doing, they have

undermined any assumption that partisan gerrymandering is a "self-limiting enterprise" because efforts to maximize partisan advantage will cut the margins too thin, weakening a party's safe seats and exposing its own incumbents to greater risks of defeat. *See Bandemer*, 478 U.S. at 152 (O'Connor, J., concurring in the judgment). Indeed, the post-2000 round of redistricting has produced the fewest competitive seats in more than 200 years of congressional history.[5]

The Court should take this opportunity to clarify that extreme partisan gerrymandering is not only justiciable in theory but remediable in actual practice. The *Badham* rule – requiring proof of discriminatory effects that in practice can never be proved – simply makes no sense.

The District Court's adoption of the *Badham* test was even more indefensible because it overlooked the significance of more recent decisions by this Court that help clarify the proper standard for identifying an unconstitutional partisan gerrymander. *First*, this Court has held that a districting plan is presumptively unconstitutional if the mapmakers allowed racial considerations to predominate over all neutral districting principles. *See Shaw v. Reno*, 509 U.S. 630 (1993); *Miller v. Johnson*, 515 U.S. 900 (1995).

---

[5] *See, e.g.*, Editorial, *Democracy Denied*, Richmond Times-Dispatch, Mar. 17, 2002, at E2 ("Precision redistricting – *i.e.*, gerrymandering – has made 380 districts safe for one party or the other. Citizens will cast ballots in November, but their votes effectively were counted when the pols drew the lines."); Juliet Eilperin, *House Democrats' Climb Gets Steeper: Party Lacks Rallying Cry as Redistricting, Incumbency Cut Competitive Races*, Wash. Post, Apr. 2, 2002, at A1 ("A decade ago, there were roughly 100 competitive races following redistricting; this year there will be 30 to 40, perhaps even fewer . . . ."); *see also* Alison Mitchell, *Redistricting 2002 Produces No Great Shake-Ups*, N.Y. Times, Mar. 13, 2002, at A20 ("With Congressional redistricting almost complete, the once-a-decade redrawing of the nation's political map is turning out to favor incumbents to an unusual degree, making many of the House's swing seats into safer territory for one party or the other.").

Following the logic of these decisions, it is presumptively unconstitutional under the Equal Protection Clause for a State to subordinate all neutral districting principles to the predominant aim of maximizing partisan advantage.

Second, the Court has made clear that – in the context of *congressional* (as opposed to state-legislative) redistricting – Article I of the U.S. Constitution imposes more stringent limits on the power of the state legislatures to manipulate electoral outcomes. States may not use their power to regulate federal election procedure to dictate electoral outcomes, to advantage one class of candidates over another, or to frustrate the will of the majority of voters. *See U.S. Term Limits, Inc. v. Thornton*, 514 U.S. 779 (1995); *Cook v. Gralike*, 531 U.S. 510 (2001). The same principles require stringent limits on the power of legislatures to predetermine the results of congressional voting through strategic line-drawing.

The errors committed below in this case, and in other cases like it, demonstrate a pressing need for this Court to clarify and enforce the constitutional norm it first announced in *Bandemer* – a norm necessary to ensure fairness and competition in congressional elections.

I. THE DISTRICT COURT MISREAD *BANDEMER*.

The controlling plurality opinion in *Bandemer* established that a plaintiff who alleges "intentional discrimination against an identifiable political group and an actual discriminatory effect on that group" states a claim of unconstitutional political gerrymandering. 478 U.S. at 127. While *Bandemer* recognized that there is no guarantee of proportional representation in our winner-take-all political system, it also recognized that there is a difference between a redistricting plan that results in moderately disproportionate representation and one designed to ensure that a party that wins less than half the popular vote statewide will win a

supermajority of the seats for an entire decade. Thus, *Bandemer* emphasized three factors in assessing whether discriminatory effects are unconstitutional: (1) the likely partisan skew must be severe, handing a supermajority of the seats to one political party even if its candidates consistently earn less than half the popular vote statewide; (2) the likely duration of the skew must exceed a single election cycle and stretch on for most or all of the decade; and (3) the skew must be sufficient to strip effective control from the majority of voters and deliver it to a minority faction. The Court explained that, to make out a claim of partisan gerrymandering, a plaintiff must show that "the electoral system substantially disadvantages certain voters in their opportunity to influence the political process effectively," and that this showing can be "supported by evidence of continued frustration of the will of a majority of the voters." *Id.* at 133. In other words, redistricting should achieve "a level of parity between votes and representation sufficient to ensure that significant minority voices are heard and that majorities are not consigned to minority status," in keeping with "our general majoritarian ethic and the objective of fair and adequate representation." *Id.* at 125 n.9 (majority opinion).

A. Appellants Stated a Valid Claim Under *Bandemer*.

Appellants' allegations in this case were sufficient to establish Act 34's unconstitutionally discriminatory effects. Appellants alleged that Act 34 would generate extremely disproportionate results: Although a slight majority of Pennsylvania voters have favored Democratic candidates in recent federal elections, Act 34 is likely to produce a congressional delegation that consists of 12 to 14 Republicans and only 5 to 7 Democrats. J.S. App. 137a-

138a.[6] Appellants further alleged that this partisan skew would be locked in for at least a decade, that it would degrade the ability of the Democrats to field quality candidates and raise funds, and that it was achieved through complete disregard of the constraints imposed by adherence to traditional neutral districting principles. *Id.* 139a-144a. To be sure, establishing the discriminatory effects of a partisan gerrymander requires a showing of "more than a *de minimis* effect" on the plaintiffs, as "[d]istrict-based elections hardly ever produce a perfect fit between votes and representation," and "[i]nviting attack on minor departures from some supposed norm would too much embroil the judiciary in second-guessing" state legislatures. *Bandemer*, 478 U.S. at 133-34 (plurality opinion). But here, the predictable effect of Act 34's discrimination against Democratic voters could not possibly be considered a "minor departure" from any reasonable norm.

The level of partisan skew in this case contrasts dramatically with the facts present in *Bandemer*, where the evidence had indicated that Democrats in the 1982 elections won 51.9% of the major-party vote and received 43% of the seats in the House, and won 53.1% of the vote and 52% of the seats in the Senate. *See id.* at 115, 134, 137 n.16. Moreover, in *Bandemer*, "the District Court [had] declined to hold that the 1982 election results were the predictable consequences of the 1981 Act" or "that those results were a reliable predictor of future ones." *Id.* at 135. Here, despite the fact that Democrats consistently constitute a majority of

[6] Although the allegations in Appellants' first amended complaint initially related to Act 1, Appellants reiterated their partisan-gerrymandering claim with respect to Act 34, the remedial redistricting plan, after their appeal of the dismissal of the partisan-gerrymandering challenge to Act 1 was mooted. The District Court, in turn, considered and ultimately rejected Appellants' partisan-gerrymandering allegations as applied to Act 34. J.S. App. 11a-12a.

Pennsylvania voters in congressional elections, *see* J.S. App. 137a-138a, the predictable result of Act 34 is that Republicans will win roughly twice as many seats as the Democrats in Pennsylvania's congressional delegation, *see id.* 138a, and will hold that advantage for the remainder of the decade, *see id.* 139a-144a.

Despite *Bandemer*'s clear indication that a State may violate the Equal Protection Clause when it consigns a political majority to minority status, the District Court dismissed an equal-protection challenge to a map that dispenses with all neutral districting criteria – including compactness, preservation of communities of interest, and avoiding contests between incumbent representatives – in order to engineer districts that relegate a majority of Pennsylvania's voters to a minority of roughly one-third of the State's congressional seats. In so doing, the District Court held that voters cannot state a constitutional violation unless they can show that they have been "completely shut out of the political process" in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. That standard, however, effectively makes it impossible for voters affiliated with a disfavored political majority to state a claim of political gerrymandering.

B. The District Court's Construction of *Bandemer* Would Effectively Overrule It.

In adopting a construction of *Bandemer* that would essentially overrule it, the District Court relied entirely on *Badham v. Eu*, the first post-*Bandemer* case to address a partisan-gerrymandering challenge. That reliance was misplaced. The level of discriminatory effects in this case stands in sharp contrast with the facts of *Badham*, where the alleged partisan gerrymander resulted in a difference of 10.1 percentage points between votes and seats in one election and just 3.2 percentage points in the next election – results that appeared to be neither grossly disproportionate nor long-lasting. *Badham*, 694 F. Supp. at 670. Here, Appellants

alleged that Act 34 would produce a *consistent* gap of nearly 20 percentage points between votes and seats. That gap satisfies the discriminatory-effects requirement.

To the extent that *Badham*'s reasoning suggests a contrary result, it is important to note that it is *Bandemer*, not *Badham*, that controls this case. Although this Court summarily affirmed *Badham*, it has never endorsed its reasoning. *See Mandel v. Bradley*, 432 U.S. 173, 176 (1977) (describing the limited precedential value of summary affirmances).[7] Indeed, *Badham*'s reasoning directly conflicts with *Bandemer*'s holding. The *Badham* court dismissed Republican voters' challenge to California's congressional redistricting plan on the ground that the Republicans had not alleged sufficient discriminatory effects. Specifically, the

---

[7] This Court's other summary affirmances in political-gerrymandering cases are equally distinguishable. None of those cases involved the level of discriminatory effects presented in this case, where one party in control of both the legislative and the executive branches of state government used that power to enact a plan that would *consistently frustrate the will of the majority of voters*. *See Pope v. Blue*, 809 F. Supp. 392, 396 (W.D.N.C.) (three-judge court) (dismissing allegations that the legislature's creation of two Democratic-leaning majority-minority districts would result in a 9-to-3 Democratic majority, although Republicans accounted for one-third of state voters), *summarily aff'd*, 506 U.S. 801 (1992); *Holloway v. Hechler*, 817 F. Supp. 617, 628 (S.D. W. Va. 1992) (three-judge court) (allegations that the state legislature had purposefully drawn a map that would protect incumbent legislators), *summarily aff'd*, 507 U.S. 956 (1993); *Anne Arundel County Republican Cent. Comm. v. State Admin. Bd. of Election Laws*, 781 F. Supp. 394, 409-10 (D. Md. 1991) (three-judge court) (Niemeyer, J., dissenting) (allegations that a redistricting map was drawn to protect senior incumbents), *summarily aff'd*, 504 U.S. 938 (1992); *Fund for Accurate & Informed Representation, Inc. v. Weprin*, 796 F. Supp. 662, 669 (N.D.N.Y.) (three-judge court) (per curiam) (redistricting plan allegedly disadvantaging Republicans in State Assembly resulted from political compromise that allowed the Republicans to create a Senate plan in which they were in the majority), *summarily aff'd*, 506 U.S. 1017 (1992).

Badham court faulted the Republicans for their failure to allege

> that California Republicans have been "shut out" of the political process . . . [or] that anyone has ever interfered with Republican registration, organizing, voting, fund-raising, or campaigning. Republicans remain free to speak out on issues of public concern; plaintiffs do not allege that there are, or have ever been, any impediments to their full participation in . . . public debate . . . . Particularly conspicuous by its absence is any allegation that plaintiffs' interests are being "entirely ignore[d]" by their congressional representatives.

694 F. Supp. at 670 (internal citations omitted). The *Badham* court thus announced an "effects" standard that goes far beyond *Bandemer*: A redistricting map is unconstitutional only if it *silences* candidates and voters and leads legislators to ignore the interests of the opposing party's voters *entirely*.

The *Badham* decision was the first, but certainly not the last, to misinterpret *Bandemer* in this way. Other courts have likewise required plaintiffs to show that a particular redistricting map shuts them out of the political process as a whole by demonstrating that the map interferes with internal party processes, such as voter registration, organizing, voting, fundraising, and campaigning. *See, e.g., Pope v. Blue*, 809 F. Supp. 392, 397 (W.D.N.C.) (three-judge court), *summarily aff'd*, 506 U.S. 801 (1992). Some courts have also suggested that a plaintiff must show that the challenged redistricting plan eliminates *all* seats held by members of the disfavored party. *See, e.g., id.*

To be sure, a number of courts have criticized *Badham* for creating a standard that, in effect, makes it impossible for voters affiliated with a major political party to state a claim

of unconstitutional political gerrymandering. *See O'Lear v. Miller*, 222 F. Supp. 2d 850, 857 & n.4 (E.D. Mich.) (three-judge court), *summarily aff'd*, 123 S. Ct. 512 (2002); *White v. Alabama*, 867 F. Supp. 1571, 1575 (M.D. Ala. 1994); *Terrazas v. Slagle*, 821 F. Supp. 1162, 1173 (W.D. Tex. 1993) (three-judge court) (per curiam). But these courts, too, have required showings that make it effectively impossible for a member of a major political party to state a partisan-gerrymandering claim. They have held, for example, that a redistricting map for a particular political office is immune from challenge if members of the disfavored party hold other state or federal offices, including offices in entirely separate branches of government. *See, e.g.*, *White*, 867 F. Supp. at 1575 (requiring evidence that challenged at-large system for electing state appellate judges diluted plaintiffs' voting strength in the state political system as a whole and not just in the appellate judicial system). Or they have required a showing that a particular redistricting map turns plaintiffs into "political pariahs," such that they cannot "over the long haul counteract [partisan gerrymandering] through [their] influence in another relevant political structure or structures." *Terrazas*, 821 F. Supp. at 1174; *see id.* (rejecting political-gerrymandering claim because Texas governor – who is elected and "hence not subject to gerrymandering" –has power to veto any redistricting plan); *see also O'Lear*, 222 F. Supp. 2d at 857.

The one case in which a federal court did find a viable *Bandemer* claim – *Republican Party v. Martin*, 980 F.2d 943 (4th Cir. 1992) – would have ended with a dismissal on the pleadings under the test enunciated by the District Court in this case. *Martin* was a challenge to a statewide system for electing trial judges that had resulted in the election of just one Republican in 90 years. *See id.* at 947-49. The court rejected the defendants' demand that Republicans show they had been completely "shut out" of the political process. *See*

id. at 958. Requiring members of a major political party to allege that they have been *silenced* would be to "hold, in effect, that regardless of the specific allegations of its complaint an identifiable political group could not survive a motion to dismiss or prevail on the merits of its claim." *Id.* Such a construction, the court noted, "would render nugatory [*Bandemer*'s] holding that political groups may bring claims of partisan gerrymandering." *Id.*

Furthermore, the factors discussed by *Badham* and the District Court in this case were not the factors on which this Court relied in evaluating whether the *Bandemer* plaintiffs had stated a valid claim. The *Bandemer* plurality did not, for example, evaluate whether Democratic voters remained free to speak on issues of public concern, potentially could influence Republican legislators, or were able to elect some Democratic legislators. Instead, this Court rejected plaintiffs' claim because they had failed to establish that the disproportionate outcome of *one* election had predictably resulted from the redistricting plan or was a reliable predictor of future election results. *See Bandemer*, 478 U.S. at 134-35, 139-40 (plurality opinion). Thus, the plurality based its decision on the extent and duration of the plan's likely effects on election outcomes.

In short, to satisfy *Bandemer*'s "actual discriminatory effects" element, a plaintiff need only show that (1) "the electoral system substantially disadvantages certain voters in their opportunity to influence the political process effectively," and (2) this bias will cause "continued frustration of the will of a majority of the voters." *Id.* at 133 (plurality opinion). To be sure, this will occur infrequently – only where a State is relatively evenly balanced politically, but one party controls both the legislature and the governorship and is able to use that control to push through a congressional redistricting plan designed to entrench a consistent and substantial advantage over the other party.

But under *Bandemer*, a State violates the Equal Protection Clause when, as here, it consigns a political party to roughly one-third or less of the congressional seats, even if that party consistently wins a majority of the popular vote statewide.

The allegations in this case thus suffice to make out a partisan-gerrymandering claim under *Bandemer*. Act 34 will achieve its intended effect and produce extremely disproportionate outcomes, resulting in the "continued frustration of the will of a majority of the voters" for at least five election cycles – precisely the type of "actual discriminatory effect" that *Bandemer* identified as sufficient to state a political-gerrymandering claim. 478 U.S. at 127, 133, 135, 140 (plurality opinion). As Chief Justice Zappala put the matter, if this case does not involve a valid claim of political gerrymandering, then "no such claim exists." J.S. App. 125a; *see also* Daniel H. Lowenstein & Richard L. Hasen, *Election Law Cases and Materials* 10 (2d ed. 2002 Update) ("To say the least, it would be the rare case when a major political party could make and substantiate allegations of the sort that the *Vieth* court seems to require.").

II. UNDER THIS COURT'S *SHAW V. RENO* LINE OF CASES, ACT 34 UNCONSTITUTIONALLY SUBORDINATED NEUTRAL DISTRICTING PRINCIPLES TO RANK PARTISANSHIP.

Act 34 violates the Equal Protection Clause by emphasizing purely partisan considerations to the exclusion of traditional neutral districting principles such as compactness and respect for county and municipal boundaries. In a series of post-*Bandemer* decisions beginning with *Shaw v. Reno*, 509 U.S. 630 (1993), this Court has clarified the boundary between constitutional uses of otherwise permissible districting considerations – such as race or party affiliation – and unconstitutional discrimination. In evaluating a claim of race-based

redistricting, the *Shaw* Court held that a state legislature may not jettison neutral districting principles with the predominant purpose of advantaging or disadvantaging a particular group of voters. *Id.* at 642; *see also Miller v. Johnson*, 515 U.S. at 916-17. The Court determined that the consideration of race – which is unquestionably legitimate in redistricting decisions under Sections 2 and 5 of the Voting Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 1973, 1973c – becomes illegitimate when race is considered to the exclusion of other traditional neutral districting principles such as "compactness, contiguity, and respect for political subdivisions." *Shaw*, 509 U.S. at 647. The Court's holding was based in part on its concern for the expressive harms that stem from governmental classification of voters on the basis of their race, and in part on its concern for representational harms:

> When a district obviously is created solely to effectuate the perceived common interests of one racial group, elected officials are more likely to believe that their primary obligation is to represent only the members of that group, rather than their constituency as a whole. This is altogether antithetical to our system of representative democracy.

Id. at 648; *accord Miller*, 515 U.S. at 911-12.

The holdings in *Shaw* and *Miller* apply here as well, for two reasons. First, the representational harms the Court identified are, if anything, more acute in cases of partisan gerrymandering. When district lines are drawn solely to strengthen one party's grip on a district, the legislature sends an unmistakable message to the representative of that district that he or she need only respond to the concerns of that party's voters. Second, just as classifications based on race are of particular concern under the Equal Protection Clause, classifications based on partisan affiliation or political viewpoint are generally barred by the First and Fourteenth Amendments, as this Court has repeatedly stated in cases

involving party-based classifications and discrimination. *See, e.g., O'Hare Truck Serv., Inc. v. City of Northlake*, 518 U.S. 712, 717 (1996); *Elrod v. Burns*, 427 U.S. 347, 372-73 (1976) (plurality opinion); *Police Dep't v. Mosley*, 408 U.S. 92, 94-95 (1972); *Williams v. Rhodes*, 393 U.S. 23, 31 (1968). If the Constitution bars a districting plan that is "'unexplainable on grounds other than race,'" *Shaw*, 509 U.S. at 644 (citation omitted), a plan that is unexplainable on grounds other than political viewpoint should also be constitutionally suspect.

The Court's opinions in *Hunt v. Cromartie*, 526 U.S. 541 (1999), and *Easley v. Cromartie*, 532 U.S. 234 (2001), which drew a distinction between race and politics as districting concerns, do not bar application of the *Shaw* approach to political-gerrymandering cases. In those cases, the Court held that a district is not drawn predominantly on the basis of race in violation of *Shaw v. Reno* where the evidence is equally consistent with "a constitutional political objective" – there, the creation of one safe Democratic seat. *Easley*, 532 U.S. at 239. Although these decisions affirm that political considerations often are permissible in districting, they do not stand for the proposition that a concerted effort to minimize the voting strength of a disfavored political party *statewide*, accompanied by a complete subordination of neutral districting principles, is less of a constitutional concern than a comparable effort to separate voters based on race.

Act 34 is clearly unconstitutional under the principles announced in *Shaw*. As the District Court found, Republican legislators "jettison[ed] every . . . neutral non-discriminatory redistricting [principle]" in a single-minded effort to maximize their partisan advantage. J.S. App. 9a n.3. The product of that effort is a districting plan that can rationally be viewed only as an effort to classify voters on the basis of their political-party affiliation, without regard to traditional

neutral districting principles. *See Shaw*, 509 U.S. at 644; *Miller*, 515 U.S. at 913.

This Court, having interpreted the Fourteenth Amendment as requiring strict scrutiny of irregularly shaped districts drawn predominantly on the basis of voters' race, should take the next step and recognize that equally irregular districts drawn predominantly on the basis of voters' political viewpoint are also constitutionally suspect. Appellants have alleged – and the District Court found – that the General Assembly abandoned *every* neutral redistricting criterion to ensure that Republicans will win roughly two-thirds of Pennsylvania's districts even if Democrats receive a majority of votes statewide. Those allegations should clearly suffice to state a cognizable equal-protection claim.

III. THE PENNSYLVANIA GENERAL ASSEMBLY EXCEEDED ITS LIMITED AUTHORITY TO REGULATE FEDERAL ELECTION PROCEDURES UNDER ARTICLE I.

Finally, the District Court erred in looking to the Equal Protection Clause as the sole potential limit on political gerrymandering in congressional redistricting. The Elections Clause of Article I, Section 4, which grants States their authority to regulate federal election procedures – including the drawing of congressional districts – imposes an even more fundamental limit on political gerrymandering. To date, this Court has not addressed the contours of those limits in a political-gerrymandering case; indeed, many of the post-*Bandemer* political-gerrymandering cases, like *Bandemer* itself, have involved state-legislative redistricting, to which Article I does not apply. But in the context of a State's regulation of federal elections, recent decisions by this Court have made clear that Article I forbids States from using their Elections Clause authority to thwart the will of a majority of

the voters, as the Pennsylvania General Assembly has done in creating Act 34.[8]

In Article I of the Constitution, the Framers vested the legislative power of the United States in two chambers: the Senate, which was intended to represent the States, and the House of Representatives, which was intended to represent the People, and whose members were accordingly to be chosen "by the People of the several States." U.S. CONST. art. I, § 2. Under the Article I framework, the right to choose congressional representatives "belongs not to the States, but to the people," because "the Framers, in perhaps their most important contribution, conceived of a Federal Government directly responsible to the people, possessed of direct power over the people, and chosen directly, not by the States, but by the people." *U.S. Term Limits*, 514 U.S. at 821. This Court has held that the fundamental principle that the House of Representatives is to be chosen "by the People" bars States from valuing one person's vote in a congressional election more than another's, *see Wesberry v. Sanders*, 376 U.S. 1, 7-8 (1964); from forbidding congressional candidates who have served more than two terms to appear on the ballot, *see U.S. Term Limits*, 514 U.S. at 832-35; and from noting on the ballot a congressional candidate's failure to support term limits, *see Cook v. Gralike*, 531 U.S. at 525-26. This principle that the House should be chosen "by the People" likewise should forbid States from distorting congressional district lines to dictate the outcomes of congressional elections and to favor the party that momentarily controls the legislature, at the expense of the majority of the electorate.

---

[8] *Cf.* Michael W. McConnell, *The Redistricting Cases: Original Mistakes and Current Consequences*, 24 HARV. J.L. & PUB. POL'Y 103, 114 (2000) (arguing that districting plans that "systematically prevent[] effective majority rule" offend the Framers' republican principles).

Consistent with their vision of the House of Representatives as accountable to the people rather than to the States, the Framers limited the States' involvement in congressional elections to a tightly circumscribed power to set "[t]he Times, Places and Manner" of holding federal elections under the Elections Clause, U.S. CONST. art. I, § 4, cl. 1. This limited delegation of authority reflects the Framers' "overriding concern" regarding "the potential for States' abuse of the power." *U.S. Term Limits*, 514 U.S. at 808-09. The Framers were particularly worried that factional control of state legislatures might frustrate the will of the people in congressional elections. Discussing the Elections Clause at the Constitutional Convention, Madison noted:

> It was impossible to foresee all the abuses that might be made of the discretionary power. . . . Whenever the State Legislatures had a favorite measure to carry, they would take care so to mould their regulations as to favor the candidates they wished to succeed. Besides, the inequality of the Representation in the Legislatures of particular States, would produce a like inequality in the Natl. Legislature, as it was presumable that the Counties having the power in the former case would secure it to themselves in the latter.

2 *Records of the Federal Convention* 239.

Madison's fear that a state legislature might abuse its authority to override majority rule was echoed throughout the ratifying conventions. In Massachusetts, one delegate worried that state legislatures,

> when faction and party spirit run high, would introduce such regulations as would render the rights of the people insecure and of little value. They might make an unequal and partial division of the states into districts for the election of representatives, or they might even disqualify one third of the electors.

2 *Elliot's Debates* 22-35 (Parsons). Another delegate noted that "a part [of Congress] should proceed directly from the people, and not from their substitutes, the legislatures; therefore the legislature ought not to control the elections," since "the [state] legislature may have a power to counteract the will of a majority of the people." 2 *id.* (Dana). In North Carolina, a delegate explained that limiting the state legislatures' authority over congressional elections would help "secure a representation from every part, and prevent any improper regulations, calculated to answer party purposes only." 1 *Annals of Congress* 768 (Ames).

The Elections Clause was thus drafted not as a grant of plenary power, but rather as a limited delegation of authority to the States, confined to procedural matters such as "notices, registration, supervision of voting, protection of voters, prevention of fraud and corrupt practices, counting of votes, duties of inspectors and canvassers, and making and publication of election returns." *Smiley v. Holm*, 285 U.S. 355, 366 (1932). As the Court said in *U.S. Term Limits*, "the Framers understood the Elections Clause as a grant of authority to issue procedural regulations, and not as a source of power to dictate electoral outcomes, to favor or disfavor a class of candidates, or to evade important constitutional restraints." 514 U.S. at 833-34; *cf. Gralike*, 531 U.S. at 523.

This Court has made clear that judicial review of state regulation of election procedure to determine whether it satisfies these principles is more searching in the context of congressional redistricting than is similar review of state-legislative redistricting under the Equal Protection Clause. For example, while the Equal Protection Clause requires adherence to the one-person, one-vote principle in the context of state-legislative redistricting, it affords more flexibility to States to deviate from absolute population equality in pursuit of legitimate state policies than does Article I, Section 2, which applies to congressional

redistricting. Accordingly, although the Equal Protection Clause will tolerate population deviations at least as large as ten percent in the context of state-legislative redistricting, *see Brown v. Thomson*, 462 U.S. 835, 842 (1983), Article I prohibits even *de minimis* population deviations without adequate justification, *see Karcher*, 462 U.S. at 731-32.

Similarly, while the Constitution may tolerate somewhat larger departures from absolute neutrality in state-legislative redistricting, Article I strictly constrains the political faction that happens to control the state legislature at the right moment in the decennial redistricting cycle from dictating the composition of Pennsylvania's congressional delegation, at the expense of the right of "the people [to] choose whom they please to govern them." *U.S. Term Limits*, 514 U.S. at 793 (citation and internal quotation marks omitted). As Judge Niemeyer explained in a dissent that foreshadowed this Court's decisions in *U.S. Term Limits* and *Gralike*, "[t]here are fundamental differences between congressional districting under Art. I . . . [and] state legislative reapportionments." *Anne Arundel County Republican Cent. Comm. v. State Admin. Bd. of Election Laws*, 781 F. Supp. 394, 402 (D. Md. 1991) (three-judge court) (Niemeyer, J., dissenting) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted), *summarily aff'd*, 504 U.S. 938 (1992). Under Article I, "the State may not attempt to dictate the outcome of congressional elections" by drawing congressional districts that confer a substantial advantage on one political party. *Id.* at 402-03.

Act 34 exceeds these limits on a State's authority to regulate congressional elections. *First*, it was designed to "dictate electoral outcomes": Under the plan, the outcomes of Pennsylvania's congressional elections are largely preordained, giving Pennsylvania voters little more than the power to ratify results already engineered by the legislature's mapmakers. *See U.S. Term Limits*, 514 U.S. at 833-34;

Gralike, 531 U.S. at 523. *Second*, Act 34 frustrates the majority will by drawing districts that jettisoned all neutral districting criteria to maximize Republican advantage in congressional elections.

Act 34 is thus much more than a mere procedural regulation. It discriminates against Democratic candidates and voters and virtually guarantees a minority party's dominance for a decade. As such, it is an unconstitutional abuse of the Pennsylvania General Assembly's power under Article I of the Constitution.

CONCLUSION

The Court should note probable jurisdiction.

Respectfully submitted.

ROBERT B. HOFFMAN
REED SMITH LLP
P.O. Box 11844
Harrisburg, PA 17108
(717) 257-3042

PAUL M. SMITH
Counsel of Record
THOMAS J. PERRELLI
BRUCE V. SPIVA
SAM HIRSCH
DANIEL MACH
JENNER & BLOCK, LLC
601 Thirteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 639-6000

Counsel for Appellants

April 25, 2003

APPENDICES

Appendix A

United States District Court,
M.D. Pennsylvania.

Richard VIETH, Norma Jean Vieth, and Susan Furey,
Plaintiffs
v.
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, et al.,
Defendants

No. 1:CV-01-2439.

Jan. 24, 2003.

OPINION AND ORDER OF THE COURT

PER CURIAM.

Before the court are Plaintiffs' motion to impose remedial districts and Defendants' motion for summary judgment. The parties have briefed the issue, as has *amicus curiae.* Additionally, the parties have presented oral argument on the instant motion. Accordingly, the matter is ripe for disposition.

I. *Background*

This case involves an ongoing challenge to Pennsylvania's congressional redistricting effort. The Commonwealth initiated the redistricting process in response to the year 2000 decennial census which indicated that Pennsylvania would lose two seats in Congress due to shifts

in the national population. Accordingly, the Commonwealth enacted its initial redistricting plan. That plan has been referred to throughout this litigation as Act 1.

Shortly thereafter, Plaintiffs initiated the instant suit seeking to have Act 1 declared unconstitutional, based on the following constitutional doctrines: (1) as an unconstitutional gerrymander in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution; (2) as a violation of the principal of the one person–one vote doctrine as that doctrine is embodied in Article I and the Fourteenth Amendment Equal Protection Clause; (3) as a violation of the Privileges and Immunities Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment; and (4) as a violation of Plaintiffs' right to political association pursuant to the First Amendment. In accordance with the requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 2284, Chief Judge Edward Becker of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit appointed the present three judge panel to hear the challenge.

By an order dated February 22, 2002, the court dismissed all of Plaintiffs' claims, save for the one person–one vote claim. *See Vieth v. Pennsylvania,* 188 F. Supp. 2d 532 (M.D. Pa. 2002) [hereinafter "*Vieth I*"]. On March 11 and 12, 2002, the court held an evidentiary hearing on that claim. On April 8, 2002, the court issued an opinion and order in which a majority of the court held that Act 1 violated the dictates of one person–one vote and enjoined its implementation. *See Vieth v. Pennsylvania,* 195 F. Supp. 2d 672, 679 (M.D. Pa. 2002) [hereinafter "*Vieth II*"]. Additionally, the court granted the Pennsylvania General Assembly three weeks to submit a plan that would remedy the constitutional deficiencies in Act 1. *Id.*

Accordingly, on April 17, 2002, the General Assembly enacted a revised congressional redistricting plan. The next day, Governor Schweiker signed into law the new plan, Act 34. That bill repealed Act 1 and replaced it with Act 34's boundaries. Defendants then petitioned the court to stay its decision regarding Act 1 and to allow the 2002 congressional elections to proceed under Act 1's boundaries. Because primary elections were set to be held on May 21, 2002, the court agreed to stay its decision regarding Act 1 in order to allow the primary election to take place as scheduled. Therefore, Act 34 was not in operation for the congressional elections that took place in November of 2002. However, Act 34 is scheduled to govern the next round of congressional elections in November of 2004.

Ostensibly, Act 34 is a zero-deviation congressional redistricting plan. That is, the district-to-district populations vary by only one person, the minimum variation given that Pennsylvania's population does not divide into nineteen even districts. On April 22, 2002, Plaintiffs filed a motion for the court to impose remedial districts or, in the alternative, to begin remedial hearings. Through information presented in that motion, the court learned for the first time of a decision by the Court of Common Pleas for Armstrong County, Pennsylvania. That decision was issued on March 15, 2002–after enactment of Act 1, but before Act 34's enactment. The decision effectively altered the boundary between two voter precincts in Armstrong County–South Buffalo District Western and South Buffalo District Eastern. Those two precincts also represented the line dividing the 3rd and 12th Congressional Districts under both Act 1 and Act 34. The alteration had the effect of moving forty–nine people from the 12th Congressional District to the 3rd Congressional

District. Apparently, this would have resulted in Act 34 having a deviation of ninety-seven between its most and least populated districts. This number would have represented a deviation over fives times greater than that in Act 1. On May 16, 2002, the Commonwealth enacted another statute, Act 44, seeking to retroactively rescind the Armstrong County Court's ability to alter voter precinct boundaries.

The Board of Elections for Armstrong County then petitioned the Armstrong County Court of Common Pleas to vacate its decision altering the voter precinct boundary. By an order dated July 29, 2002, the Armstrong County Court of Common Pleas denied the motion to vacate its decision. Eventually, this court scheduled a hearing for January 9, 2003 for the parties to present oral argument regarding whether Act 34 remedied the constitutional defect that the court found rendered Act 1 infirm.

In the interim, Governor Schweiker signed Act 150 into law on December 9, 2002. That statute amended § 506 of the Pennsylvania Election Code to add the following statement:

> In administering elections for the nomination and election of candidates for the United States House of Representatives and the General Assembly, county boards of election shall adhere to the following rule: Where an election district is used in or pursuant to a congressional redistricting statute or the final plan of the Legislative Reapportionment Commission to define the boundary of a congressional district or state legislative district, the boundary of such election shall be the boundary existing and recognized by the Legislative

> Reapportionment Commission for the adoption of its final plan. The boundaries of the Congressional districts, as established by statute, and state legislative districts as set forth in the final plan of the Legislative Reapportionment Commission shall remain in full force and effect for use thereafter until the next reapportionment or redistricting as required by law and shall not be deemed to be affected by any action taken pursuant to this title.

Therefore, Act 150 had the apparent effect of negating the alteration of the boundary dividing the 3rd and 12th Congressional Districts.[1] Defendants subsequently filed a motion for summary judgment on December 20, 2002. On December 30, 2002, the court issued an order indicating that the parties should be prepared to present oral argument on this motion at the January 9 hearing and that Plaintiffs should file their brief in opposition to summary judgment before the date of the hearing. On January 7, 2002, Plaintiffs filed their response to Defendants' summary judgment motion. On January 9, 2002, the court held its hearing.

The court's order of April 8, 2002 gave Defendants a period of time to "enact and submit for review and final approval by this Court, a congressional redistricting plan in conformity with this opinion." *See Vieth II*, 195 F. Supp. 2d at 679. In response, the Commonwealth enacted Act 34. In accordance with the matters discussed at the January 9

---

[1] Plaintiffs conceded at oral argument–and in their brief–that Act 150, if validly enacted, eliminated any one person-one vote issue with reference to Act 34. (*See* Pls. Br. in Opp. Defs. Mot. for Sum. J. at 9 ("Act 150, if it were validly enacted and interpreted as Defendants suggest, would eliminate any one–person, one–vote concerns raised by Act 34.").)

hearing, the court finds that Act 34 sufficiently remedies the constitutional deficiencies of Act 1. Our hearing, was basically a review of Act 34 and we are now giving final approval to it. For the reasons stated below, the court finds that Act 34 does not violate any constitutional doctrine. The court, therefore, will deny Plaintiffs' motion to impose remedial districts. This decision renders Defendants' motion for summary judgment moot. The court, therefore, will not address that motion.

II. *Analysis*

A. Population Deviation

Article I, § 2 of the United States Constitution requires that members of Congress be chosen with equal representation for equal number of people. *Wesberry v. Sanders*, 376 U.S. 1, 7-8, 84 S. Ct. 526, 11 L. Ed. 2d 481 (1964). This constitutional mandate, commonly referred to as the one person–one vote principle, requires "that as nearly as is practicable one man's vote in a congressional election is to be worth as much as another's." *Id.* As the Supreme Court has explained:

> [T]he "nearly as practicable" standard requires that the State make a good-faith effort to achieve precise mathematical equality.... Unless population variances among congressional districts are shown to have resulted, despite such effort, the State must justify each variance, no matter how small.... [Article I, § 2, therefore] permits only the limited population variances "*which are unavoidable despite a good-faith effort to achieve absolute equality, or for which justification is shown.*"

Kirkpatrick v. Preisler, 394 U.S. 526, 530-31, 89 S. Ct. 1225, 22 L. Ed. 2d 519 (1969) (emphasis added).

Thus, in a challenge to a congressional redistricting plan, the plaintiff bears the initial burden of proving: (1) that a deviation exits in district-to-district population which could have been reduced; and (2) the deviation is not a result of a good faith effort to achieve exact equality in district-to-district population. *See Karcher v. Daggett*, 462 U.S. 725, 730, 103 S. Ct. 2653, 77 L. Ed. 2d 133 (1983) (holding that the plaintiff's initial burden is to prove that the differences in district-to-district population could have been reduced or eliminated by "a good-faith effort to draw districts of equal population"). If the plaintiffs can meet its burden, then the State must prove that some legitimate reason justifies the variances. *See id.* at 731, 103 S. Ct. 2653.

As to Act 1, the court unanimously found that Plaintiffs satisfied their initial burden. *See Vieth II*, 195 F. Supp. 2d at 676, 679. Crucial to this holding was the testimony of Dr. John Memmi, the Republican House Caucus's congressional redistricting map-maker. Dr. Memmi testified that the Republican House leaders instructed him to stop shifting populations between districts once the process yielded a map with a nineteen person deviation. Although the court noted that such a deviation is minuscule given that Pennsylvania's census population totaled 12,281,054, it also noted that "*Karcher* specifically holds that 'there are no *de minimis* variations which could practically be avoided, but nonetheless meet the standard of Art. I, § 2 without justification.'" *Id.* at 676 (quoting *Karcher*, 462 U.S. at 734, 103 S. Ct. 2653). Because the population deviation in Act 1

was not the result of a good faith effort to achieve precise mathematical equality in district-to-district populations, the court held that Plaintiffs satisfied their initial burden under the *Karcher/Kirkpatrick* framework. *Id.*

Therefore, the burden switched to Defendants to justify the minuscule deviation in Act 1. A majority of the court held that Defendants failed to proffer any legitimate justification for the deviation. *Id.* at 678. The dissenting member of the court, however, found that Defendants justified the deviation by demonstrating that making Act 1 a zero deviation map would entail splitting twenty additional voter precinct districts; thus resulting in additional administrative costs and voter confusion. *Id.* at 680 (Yohn, J. dissenting in part).[2]

As to Act 34, the court finds that Plaintiffs have failed to satisfy their burden. First, Plaintiffs have failed to demonstrate that the variations in district-to-district population could have been reduced. Act 34 is a zero–deviation plan. They also argue that the Armstrong County Court's decision results in Act 34 having a ninety-seven person deviation. In response, Defendants contend that Act 150 effectively nullifies that change, forcing county boards of elections to use the same boundaries that were established by the Legislative Reapportionment Commission prior to the enactment of both Act 1 and Act 34. We do not need to decide this issue because even if Act 150 could not undo the Armstrong County Court's alteration, the court finds that Act

[2] The majority, in contrast, noted evidence indicating that it was possible to draw a zero deviation map that split no voter precincts. *See id.* at 677 (noting that "it is possible to draw a congressional district map with zero deviation and no precinct splits").

34, Act 44, and Act 150 represent "a good faith effort to draw districts of equal population." *Karcher*, 462 U.S. at 730, 103 S. Ct. 2653.

The court is convinced that the General Assembly passed Act 34 expecting that it would be a zero-deviation map. This is evidenced by the fact that since the Armstrong County Court's decision, the General Assembly has twice, through enactment of Acts 44 and 150, sought to undo the alteration brought about by that decision. These three statutes, when read together, evidence a good–faith effort to draw districts of equal population, even if Acts 44 and 150 are later declared invalid as violations of the Pennsylvania Constitution as Plaintiffs argue they should be.[3] As to Act 34, unlike Act 1, there is no evidence indicating that the General Assembly intended that there be a deviation or that it considered the slight deviation a non–issue. *See Vieth II*, 195 F. Supp. 2d at 676 (discussing Dr. Memmi's testimony and concluding that "Defendants did not put forth a good-faith effort to draw districts of equal population"). Likewise, there

[3] The court notes that Act 34 represents a good faith effort to achieve zero deviation, but like its predecessor, Act 1, jettisons every other neutral non-discriminatory redistricting criteria that the Supreme Court has endorsed in one person-one vote cases. *See Karcher*, 462 U.S. at 753-59, 103 S. Ct. 2653 (Stevens, J. concurring) (holding that compliance with neutral criteria demonstrates that the legislature's intention is designed to further non-discriminatory policies); *see also Vieth II*, 195 F. Supp. 2d at 678 ("[I]t is clear that *Karcher*'s neutral criteria were not high on the priority list in enacting Act 1.") Despite an opportunity to improve upon the numerous deficiencies of Act 1, Defendants have returned to this court with essentially the same map. However, this map does not possess the same population deviations as Act 1. Therefore, Plaintiffs have failed to meet their initial burden under *Karcher*, and the court has no opportunity to address these criteria as they relate to Act 34.

is no evidence in the record indicating that members of the General Assembly, when passing Act 34, relied on anything other than the population data prepared from the census tracts compiled by the bi-partisan Legislative Data Processing Center in considering the population of election precincts and congressional districts. Moreover, there is no evidence in the record which suggests that members of the legislature were even aware of the change in the election districts in South Buffalo Township when they voted to pass Act 34 on April 17, 2002. There is simply no evidence in the record indicating that the General Assembly intended to enact anything other than a zero-deviation congressional redistricting plan. The court, therefore, finds that Act 34 represents a good faith effort to achieve precise mathematical equality in congressional district-to-district population. Accordingly, Plaintiffs have failed to satisfy their burden.

Because the court finds that Plaintiffs have failed to satisfy their initial burden under the *Karcher* test, no inquiry regarding justification is needed for there is nothing to justify. Act 34 complies with the dictates of the one person–one vote doctrine.

B. Plaintiffs' Challenge to Act 150 based on Pennsylvania Constitutional Law

Plaintiffs challenge the validity of Act 150 on the basis that it violates a litany of Pennsylvania Constitutional doctrines. However, because the court has already held that Acts 34, 44 and 150, when read in conjunction, evidence a good-faith effort to achieve population equality, the validity of these statutes is immaterial. *See Kirkpatrick*, 394 U.S. at 530-31, 89 S. Ct. 1225 ("[T]he 'nearly as practicable'

standard requires that the State make a good-faith effort to achieve mathematical equality. *Unless population variances among congressional districts are shown to have resulted despite such effort,* the State must justify each variance, no matter how small." (emphasis added)).

The court, therefore, need not decide these issues of Pennsylvania law because even if they were resolved in Plaintiffs' favor, the court finds that the three statutes at issue–Acts 34, 44, and 150–at the very least represent a good-faith effort to achieve equal district-to-district population. Even if Acts 44 and 150 were to be declared invalid, this would have no effect on the claim that Act 34 violates the one person-one vote doctrine.

C. Partisan Gerrymandering

Plaintiffs also seek to preserve their argument that Act 34 is a partisan gerrymandering and, thus, violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. As discussed earlier, Plaintiffs presented the same argument with respect to Act 1. In *Vieth I*, the court dismissed this claim because "Plaintiffs [did not] allege facts indicating that they have been shut out of the political process and, therefore, they cannot establish an actual discriminatory effect on them," as required by *Davis v. Bandemer*, 478 U.S. 109, 106 S. Ct. 2797, 92 L. Ed. 2d 85 (1986). *Vieth I*, 188 F. Supp. 2d 532, 547 (M.D. Pa. 2002). Act 34 is essentially the same redistricting plan as Act 1, except for the fact that Act 34 does not possess an avoidable population deviation. Accordingly, whatever partisan effect Act 1 had, Act 34 will have as well. The court, therefore, incorporates by reference its discussion in *Vieth I* regarding partisan gerrymandering

and holds that the undisputed facts in this case are insufficient to establish such a claim. *See id.* at 543-47.

IV. *Conclusion*

Act 34 does not violate the principal of one person-one vote. Therefore, Act 34 remedies Act 1's constitutional defect. Additionally, Act 34 is not a partisan gerrymandering, at least as far as that term is defined by the Supreme Court in *Davis v. Bandemer*, 478 U.S. 109, 106 S. Ct. 2797, 92 L. Ed. 2d 85 (1986). Therefore, the court will deny Plaintiff's motion to impose remedial districts. Because the court has decided that Act 34 cures the constitutional defect found by the court in its memorandum and order of April 8, 2002, Defendants' motion for summary judgment is moot. An appropriate order will issue.

ORDER

In accordance with the attached opinion of the court, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

Plaintiffs' motion to impose remedial district is DENIED. Act 34 does not violate the United States Constitution;

Defendants' motion for summary judgment is DENIED AS MOOT; and

In conformity with court's order of April 8, 2002, the Congressional Redistricting Plan contained in Act 34 is given final approval. The Clerk of Court is direct to enter judgment in favor of Defendants and against Plaintiffs.

Appendix B

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

RICHARD VIETH, NORMA JEAN VIETH, and SUSAN FUREY, Plaintiffs v. COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, *et al.*, Defendants

CIVIL NO.1:CV-01-2439

February 22, 2002, Decided

February 22, 2002, Filed

OPINION OF THE COURT[1]

Before the court are: (1) a motion to dismiss pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1) filed by Defendants Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania Governor Mark Schweiker, Secretary of State Kim Pizzingrilli, and Commissioner of the Bureau of Commissions, Elections, and Legislation Richard Filling ("Executive Officers"); (2) Defendant Executive Officers' motion to dismiss pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6); (3) a Rule 12(b)(1) motion to dismiss filed by Defendants Matthew Ryan and Robert Jubelirer

[1] RAMBO, SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE authored the Opinion of the Court in which NYGAARD, CIRCUIT JUDGE and YOHN, DISTRICT JUDGE join.

("Presiding Officers")[2]; and (4) Defendant Presiding Officers' motion to dismiss pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6). The parties have briefed the issues, and the matter is ripe for disposition.

I. Background

A. Factual Allegations

Plaintiffs Richard Vieth, Norma Jean Vieth, and Susan Furey brought this action, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, against Defendant Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Defendant Executive Officers, and Defendant Presiding Officers. Plaintiffs' claims arise out of the enactment of Pennsylvania Senate Bill 1200 ("Act 1"), Pennsylvania's Congressional redistricting plan, which Governor Schweiker signed into law on January 7, 2002.

Plaintiffs allege the following facts in their complaint: On December 28, 2000, the United States Secretary of Commerce reported the results of the year 2000 decennial national census to then President William J. Clinton. The tabulation indicated that as of April 1, 2000 Pennsylvania had a resident population of 12,281,054 persons. Accordingly, the Secretary of Commerce's report allotted Pennsylvania only nineteen Congressional representatives resulting in a decrease of two representatives from the results of the 1990 census.

Thus, the responsibility for adopting a Congressional redistricting plan fell to Pennsylvania's General Assembly,

[2] Defendant Ryan is the Speaker of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives, and Defendant Jubelirer is the Lieutenant Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Thus, Speaker Ryan presides over the Pennsylvania House of Representatives, and Lieutenant Governor Jubelirer presides over the Pennsylvania State Senate.

which failed to reach a compromise during the regular 2001 legislative session. The State House of Representatives passed one version, and the State Senate passed a different plan. The General Assembly, however, adjourned at an impasse on December 13, 2001.[3]

In the meantime, prominent national figures in the Republican party – such as congressional Speaker of the House Dennis Hastert, Congressman Thomas M. Davis III, United States Senator Rick Santorum, and Karl Rove, political consultant to current President George W. Bush – began pressuring Governor Schweiker, a Republican, and the Republican members of the General Assembly to adopt the Senate redistricting plan as a punitive measure against Democrats for having enacted apparently pro-Democrat redistricting plans in other states. In response, Republican members of the state House and Senate began working together to reach an agreement. In the process, they effectively ignored all Democratic members of the General Assembly, including members of the Conference Committee appointed to resolve the impasse between the competing plans.

At the Conference Committee meeting on January 2, 2002, the Republicans presented the final version ("Senate Bill 1200") of the new redistricting plan. The Democratic members of the Conference Committee had no input on this version. Although the bill passed the Conference Committee, thus sending it for a vote before both houses, all Democratic members of the Conference Committee voted against the version, and all Republicans voted in favor. On January 3, 2002, the General Assembly passed Senate Bill 1200. On

[3] Plaintiffs also allege that the Republican party enjoys majorities in both state houses and holds the Governor's office.

January 7, 2002, Governor Schweiker signed the bill into law as Act 1.

Plaintiffs, registered Democrats and Pennsylvania citizens, subsequently filed this suit to enjoin Act 1's implementation. Plaintiffs Richard and Norma Jean Vieth both reside in Lebanon County, Pennsylvania, in a portion of the county that will fall in District 16 under Act 1. Plaintiff Susan Furey resides in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania. Under Act 1's precursor, Plaintiff Furey's residence fell in District 13. However, under Act 1, Plaintiff Furey now resides in District 6. Defendants are the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and various executive and legislative officers who were either responsible for enacting Act 1 or will be responsible for implementing it during the next Congressional election.

According to the results of the 2000 census, Pennsylvania has a population of 12,281,054. When divided equally among the nineteen Congressional districts, this results in a population of 646,371 or 646,372 people per district.[4] However, under Act 1, District 7 would have a population of 646,380. On the other hand, Districts 1, 2, and 17 would each have a population of 646,361. Thus, under Act 1 there is a nineteen-person deviation between the least populated and most populated districts. While this is less than the deviation under the 1992 plan, unlike that plan, Act 1 splits eighty-four local governments (including twenty-five counties and fifty-nine cities, boroughs or townships) among different congressional districts. Montgomery County, where Plaintiff Furey resides, is divided up among six different congressional districts. Under the 1992 plan, only twenty-seven local governments (nineteen counties and eight cities, townships or boroughs) were split between different districts.

[4] The actual result is 646,371.263157.

Additionally, Districts 4, 6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, and 19 have populations of over 646,372 without any legitimate justification.

Currently, the two major parties hold nearly equal support in the Commonwealth. Of voters registered with one of the two major parties, 53.6% are registered Democrats and 46.4% are registered Republicans. In November 2000, during the last election held under the 1992 plan, voters in Pennsylvania elected eleven Republican congressman and ten Democratic congressman to serve in Washington. In those twenty-one congressional races, Democrats garnered 50.6% of the aggregate vote, with Republicans receiving 49.4%. Democrats also received more total votes than Republicans, by a margin of 50.1% to 49.9%, in the five statewide races in 2000.[5] Yet despite this nearly equal split, Democrats will likely win only six of Pennsylvania's nineteen congressional seats. Thus, Act 1 is "designed to ensure that Republicans would win at least 13 of the 19 congressional seats." (Amd. Compl. at ¶ 32.) "It cements Republican power and effectively reduces Democrats to being a small minority of the Commonwealth's congressional delegation for the coming election and likely the coming decade." (*Id.* at ¶ 33.)

As a direct result, Act 1 "dramatically affects the Democratic Party's prospects for success in congressional elections in Pennsylvania ... and will reduce the choices that voters ... will have in Pennsylvania elections." (*Id.* at ¶ 35.)

[5] In 2000, Pennsylvania held statewide elections for President, one United States Senate position, State Attorney General, State Auditor General, and State Treasurer. Democratic candidates won the elections for President and Auditor General, and Republican candidates won the elections for Attorney General, State Treasurer and United States Senator.

"Because of the bias ... the Democratic Party will have greater difficulty in fielding competitive candidates." (*Id.*) Thus, Act 1 operates "to essentially shut Democrats and Democratic voters out of the political process." (*Id.* at ¶ 36.) Plaintiffs, in particular, "will suffer harm ... [because they] will now be increasingly represented by members of Congress who do not represent their views." (*Id.* at ¶ 37.)

B. Procedural History

On December 21, 2001, Plaintiffs filed the original complaint in this matter. Subsequently, Plaintiffs filed a motion to convene a three-judge panel pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2284(b)(1). By an order dated January 23, 2002, the court granted Plaintiffs' motion and requested that Chief Judge Edward Becker of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals appoint the members of the panel. Chief Judge Becker appointed the current panel: The Honorable Richard Nygaard, United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit Court of Appeals; The Honorable William H. Yohn, Jr., United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania; and The Honorable Sylvia Rambo, Senior United States District Court Judge for the Middle District of Pennsylvania.

On January 11, 2002, Plaintiffs filed an amended complaint alleging violations of 42 U.S.C. § 1983.[6] In that document, Plaintiffs allege that Act 1 violates: (1) Article I,

[6] Plaintiffs include the violation of § 1983 under a separate count. However, "§ 1983 does not create substantive rights but 'merely redresses the deprivation of ... rights. . . created by the Constitution or federal statute.'" *Ridgewood Bd. of Educ. v. N.E. for M.E.*, 172 F.3d 238, 251-52 (3d Cir. 1999) (quoting *W.B. v. Matula*, 67 F.3d 484, 493 (3d Cir. 1995)). Therefore, the court will construe Plaintiffs' amended complaint as an action brought pursuant to § 1983 to vindicate their rights under the Constitution.

§ 2 of the United States Constitution; (2) the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment; (3) the Privileges and Immunities Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment; and (4) Plaintiffs' right to free association guaranteed by the First Amendment. Accordingly, Plaintiffs seek the following declaratory and injunctive relief: (1) a declaratory judgment that Act 1 violates Plaintiffs' constitutional rights; (2) a permanent injunction preventing Defendants from implementing Act 1; (3) a court order establishing a new congressional redistricting plan and enjoining Defendants from enacting or implementing a new plan until the 2004 elections; and (4) attorney's fees and court costs.

On January 22, 2002, Plaintiffs filed a motion requesting that the court set a deadline of February 18, 2002 for the state courts to conclude all litigation pertaining to Act 1.[7] Additionally, Plaintiffs filed an expedited motion for appointment of the three-judge panel. By an order dated January 24, 2002, the court denied Plaintiffs' motion to set a deadline and denied, as moot, Plaintiffs' expedited motion to convene a three-judge panel. By a separate order issued on January 24, 2002, the court set the case for an evidentiary hearing to be conducted on February 11 and February 12, 2002.

Also on January 24, 2002, both Defendant Presiding Officers and Executive Officers filed the separate motions to dismiss which are currently before the court. Defendant Presiding Officers followed this with a motion to abstain, filed on January 25, 2002. By separate orders, the court

[7] Currently, there is a state court action pending which attacks Act 1 on the basis that it violates the Pennsylvania Constitution. *See Efer v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania*, 10 M.D. 2002 (Pa. Commw. Ct.).

established an expedited briefing schedule for both the motions to dismiss and the motion for abstention.

Defendant Presiding Officers filed a motion for reconsideration and *vacatur* of the court's January 24, 2002 order that set the captioned matter for an evidentiary hearing starting February 11, 2002. The court held a telephone conference on January 29, 2002, which all parties attended, in order to discuss the reconsideration motion. During the conference call, counsel informed the court that the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania issued an order that afternoon requiring the Commonwealth Court to hold a hearing on Act 1 by February 1, 2002. Additionally, the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania ordered the Commonwealth Court to issue findings of fact and conclusions of law by February 8, 2002 addressing the validity of Act 1 under the Pennsylvania Constitution. In light of these circumstances, by an order dated January 30, 2002, the court delayed the evidentiary hearing until March 11, 2002 and set an expedited discovery schedule.

II. Discussion

A. Motion to Dismiss pursuant to Rule 12(b)(1)

1. Legal Standard

"A motion to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(1) challenges the jurisdiction of the court to address the merits of the plaintiff's complaint." *Ballenger v. Applied Digital Solutions, Inc.*, 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1518 at *8 (D. Del. January 31, 2002). The motion should be granted where the asserted claim is "in substantial, implausible, foreclosed by prior decisions of this Court, or otherwise completely devoid of merit as not to involve a federal controversy." *Coxson v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania*, 935 F. Supp. 624, 626

(W.D. Pa. 1996) (citing *Growth Horizons v. Delaware County*, 983 F.2d 1277, 1280-81 (3d Cir. 1993)). Additionally, a motion to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(1) may present either a facial or factual challenge to subject matter jurisdiction. *See Mortensen v. First Federal Savings and Loan*, 549 F.2d 884, 891 (3d Cir. 1977).

This case presents a facial challenge because Defendants do not dispute, at this juncture, the existence of the jurisdictional facts alleged in the complaint. *See* 2 James Wm. Moore *et al.*, Moore's Federal Practice ¶ 12.30[4] (3d ed. 1999) (explaining the difference between a facial and factual challenge to subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to Rule 12(b)(1)). Therefore, the court must accept the facts alleged in the complaint as true, and draw all reasonable inferences in favor of the plaintiff. *Zinerman v. Burch*, 494 U.S. 113 (1990); *Markowitz v. Northeast Land Co.*, 906 F.2d 100, 103 (3d Cir. 1990).

2. Partisan Gerrymandering Claim

In their motions to dismiss, Defendants contend that claims of partisan gerrymandering are non-justiciable. Thus, according to Defendants, the court lacks subject matter jurisdiction to hear such claims. However, Defendants also acknowledge that in *Davis v. Bandemer*, 478 U.S. 109 (1986), the Supreme Court held that such claims are justiciable as equal protection violations. Instead of arguing for dismissal, Defendants wish to have their objections to this holding noted on the record in case they seek to raise the issue at a later time. Accordingly, the court notes the objection.

3. Eleventh Amendment Immunity

Defendant Commonwealth of Pennsylvania seeks dismissal of the claims against it arguing that it is immune

from suit in federal court based on Eleventh Amendment sovereign immunity. At a minimum, the Eleventh Amendment stands for two propositions: "first, that each State is a sovereign entity in our federal system; and second, that it is inherent in the nature of sovereignty not to be amenable to the suit of an individual without its consent." *Seminole Tribe of Fla. v. Florida*, 517 U.S. 44, 54 (1996) (internal quotations omitted). Thus, the Eleventh Amendment "prohibits federal courts from entertaining suits by private parties against States and their agencies." *Alabama v. Pugh*, 438 U.S. 781, 791 (1978). This bar applies regardless of whether the plaintiff seeks monetary damages or injunctive relief against a State. *Seminole Tribe*, 517 U.S. at 58 (citing *Cory v. White*, 457 U.S. 85, 90 (1982) ("It would be a novel proposition indeed that the Eleventh Amendment does not bar a suit to enjoin the State itself simply because no money judgment is sought.")).

Under certain circumstances, the Eleventh Amendment does not bar federal courts from entertaining suits against States. First, suit is permitted where the State has waived its immunity. *Atascadero State Hosp. v. Scanlon*, 473 U.S. 234, 241 (1985). Second, sovereign immunity does not apply if Congress validly abrogates it through its enforcement powers pursuant to the Fourteenth Amendment. *Seminole Tribe*, 517 U.S. at 57-73. Third, Eleventh Amendment immunity is inapplicable where the plaintiff sues State officials in their official capacity seeking only prospective relief. *Ex Parte Young*, 209 U.S. 123 (1908).

In this case, Plaintiffs have brought suit against the Commonwealth thereby implicating its sovereign immunity. Plaintiffs do not contend that the Commonwealth has waived its immunity, nor could they. Pennsylvania has clearly reserved its power to invoke sovereign immunity. 42 Pa.

Cons. Stat. Ann. § 8521(b) (2001). Likewise, Plaintiffs could not contend that by enacting § 1983, Congress validly abrogated Pennsylvania's sovereign immunity. *See Quern v. Jordan*, 440 U.S. 332, 345 (1978) ("[Section] 1983 does not explicitly and by clear language indicate on its face an intent to sweep away the immunity of the States; nor does it have a history which focuses directly on the question of state liability and which shows that Congress considered and firmly decided to abrogate the Eleventh Amendment immunity of the States."). *Ex Parte Young* is not implicated here. The Commonwealth is the only defendant to raise sovereign immunity as a defense.

Because the Eleventh Amendment bars suit against the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania under the circumstances present in this case, the court will dismiss the action against the Commonwealth for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

4. Standing

The constitutional minimum of standing contains three elements:

> First, the plaintiff must have suffered an "injury in fact" -- an invasion of a legally protected interest that is (a) concrete and particularized, and (b) actual or imminent, not conjectural or hypothetical. Second, there must be a causal connection between the injury and the conduct complained of ... Third, it must be likely, as opposed to merely speculative, that the injury will be redressed by a favorable decision.

Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555, 560-61 (1992) (citations omitted). The party who seeks the exercise of jurisdiction bears the burden of alleging facts that "he is a proper party to invoke judicial resolution of the dispute."

Warth v. Seldin, 422 U.S. 490, 518 (1975); *see also McNutt v. General Motors Acceptance Corp.*, 298 U.S. 178, 189 (1936).

a. Partisan Gerrymandering

Defendants contend that Count II of Plaintiffs' amended complaint, alleging that Act 1 constitutes impermissible partisan gerrymandering in violation of the Equal Protection Clause, must be dismissed because Plaintiffs lack standing. The crux of Defendants' argument is that Plaintiffs do not have standing to challenge Act 1 as a whole.[8]

Defendants would have the court apply the standing requirement for racial gerrymandering cases to those involving only partisan gerrymandering. In the context of racial gerrymandering, in order to have standing a plaintiff must allege that he resides in a district that has been impermissibly gerrymandered on the basis of race. *United States v. Hays*, 515 U.S. 737, 743-44 (1995). Racial gerrymandering is prohibited because, where a district is created solely to serve the perceived common interests of one racial group, it is reasonable to presume that elected officials in such districts will ignore the plights of non-members of the dominant racial group. This stems from the corollary that racial classifications are disfavored in general because they threaten to stigmatize individuals according to their race and incite racial hostility. *Id. at* 744 (citing *Shaw v. Reno*, 509 U.S. 630, 648 (1993)). Therefore, only where a person resides in a district created to cater to one race over

[8] Defendants also argue that Plaintiffs have failed to establish standing because Plaintiffs "allege only group harm (i.e., to Democrat voters & the Democrat Party), not harm to their individual interests." (Def. Pres. Offs. Br. in Sup. Mot. to Dis. at 6.) However, Defendants overlook the fact that Plaintiffs allege harm to them as individual members of the Democratic party.

another can he allege to have suffered the particularized harm necessary to justify standing. "On the other hand, where a plaintiff does not live in such a district, he ... does not suffer those special harms, and any inference that the plaintiff has personally been subject to a racial classification would not be justified absent evidence tending to support that inference." *Id.* at 745.

The reasoning underlying claims based on racial gerrymandering, however, is quite distinct from the type of injury that partisan gerrymandering inflicts. The very nature of a claim of partisan gerrymandering contemplates a harm which extends beyond that inflicted upon a particular voter. Rather, such a claim envisions harm to a particular class of voters that results in impermissibly denying them participation in the political process. The Supreme Court recognized this principal in *Davis v. Bandemer*, the first case holding that partisan gerrymandering may be actionable as a violation of equal protection. In that decision, the Court stated: "Although the statewide discrimination here was allegedly accomplished through the manipulation of individual district lines, the focus of the equal protection inquiry is necessarily somewhat different from that involved in the review of individual districts." 478 U.S. at 127.[9]

In equal protection claims based on partisan gerrymandering, the allegation is that an identifiable political group has had its political voice silenced through the drawing of elective district lines. Although this involves, to a certain extent, manipulation of individual district lines, the

[9] Moreover, we note that to the extent that an individual plaintiff is required to live in an allegedly gerrymandered district, Plaintiffs have met that requirement. Plaintiff Furey lives in District 6. (Amd. Compl. at ¶ 4.) Plaintiffs allege that District 6 is one of the gerrymandered districts. (Amd. Compl. at ¶ 22.)

injury is done to the entire identifiable political group. The constitutional injury lies not in inequality among various individual districts, but rather in the configuration of the districts as a whole when they serve to disadvantage a certain class of voters. Therefore, unlike a claim for race-based gerrymandering, a plaintiff in a partisan gerrymandering claim need not allege that he lives in a particular district that has been gerrymandered on the basis of political affiliation.

Additionally, we do not agree with Defendants that adopting such a standing rule would endow nationwide standing upon all individual members of the major political parties. In the context of partisan gerrymandering, to satisfy the particularized harm requirement, a plaintiff must allege that he or she is a member of a politically salient class whose geographical distribution is sufficiently ascertainable that it could have been taken into account when drawing district boundaries. In this case, Plaintiffs allege that they are citizens of Pennsylvania and members of the Democratic party. Additionally, they allege that Defendants have utilized the congressional redistricting process to vanquish Plaintiffs' political voice in Congress. These allegations, together, are sufficient to satisfy the particularized injury requirement for standing.

b. Remaining Claims

As to the remaining claims, Defendants intimate that Plaintiffs do not have standing because the injury that they allege is "speculative and generalized," (Def. Exec. Offs. Br. in Sup. Mot. to Dis. at 7,) and is "a purely hypothetical harm, tied to the allegation of partisan gerrymandering." (Def. Pres. Offs. Br. in Sup. Mot to Dis. at 7.) We disagree.

Defendants are correct that Plaintiffs do not allege that they have suffered an injury in fact as of this moment. However, Act 1 has yet to be implemented. Plaintiffs have

clearly alleged that if Act 1 is allowed to be implemented it will cause a very real harm. Principally, Plaintiffs claim that their vote has been diluted in violation of the one person-one vote requirement of Article I. That harm is completely distinct from the harm that would be inflicted as a result of partisan gerrymandering. Act 1 has been enacted and, as of now, is scheduled to be used as the congressional district plan in the 2002 elections. If Act 1 is – as Plaintiffs have alleged – unconstitutional, then Plaintiffs have alleged a harm that is "actual or imminent, not conjectural or hypothetical." *Lujan*, 504 U.S. at 560. Therefore, the court has no problem concluding that Plaintiffs have alleged an injury in fact.[10] Likewise, Plaintiffs have sufficiently pleaded a causal connection between Defendants' conduct and the injury. Finally, as will be discussed below, *see infra* at Part II.B.7, the court has the remedial powers to redress the injuries that Plaintiffs have alleged. In short, the court finds that the allegations of Counts I, III, and IV of Plaintiffs' amended complaint satisfy the constitutional minimum of standing.

B. Motion to Dismiss pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6)

1. Legal Standard

In deciding a motion to dismiss pursuant to Federal Rule 12(b)(6), the court is required to accept as true all of the factual allegations in the complaint and all reasonable inferences that can be drawn from the face of the complaint. *Nami v. Fauver*, 82 F.3d 63, 65 (3d Cir. 1996). "The complaint will be deemed to have alleged sufficient facts if it

---

[10] As to the one person-one vote claim, the court notes that no Plaintiff resides in an under-populated district. Additionally, Plaintiffs have alleged that there are districts that are under populated. Therefore, according to Plaintiffs' allegations, they have suffered an injury in fact due to vote dilution.

adequately put[s] the defendant[s] on notice of the essential elements of the plaintiff's cause of action." *Id.* The court will not dismiss a complaint for failure to state a claim "unless it appears beyond a doubt that the plaintiff[s] can prove no set of facts in support of [their] claim that would entitle [them] to relief." *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 45-46 (1957).

"In determining whether a claim should be dismissed under [Federal] Rule 12(b)(6), a court looks only to the facts alleged in the complaint and its attachments without reference to other parts of the record." *Jordan v. Fox, Rothschild, O'Brien & Frankel*, 20 F.3d 1250, 1261 (3d Cir. 1994). However, the court may consider "undisputedly authentic document[s] that a defendant attaches as an exhibit to a motion to dismiss if the plaintiff's claims are based on the [attached] document[s]." *Pension Ben. Guar. Corp. v. White Consol. Ind*, 998 F.2d 1192, 1196 (3d Cir. 1993).

2. Article I (One person-One vote)

In Count I of their amended complaint, Plaintiffs allege that Act 1 violates Article I, § 2 of the United States Constitution[11] by diluting the vote of persons living in over-populated congressional districts. Defendants contend that this claim must be dismissed because Plaintiffs have failed to allege that: (1) a plan with smaller population deviations than Act 1 could have been enacted; or (2) that the deviations in Act 1 were unavoidable.

Article I, § 2, requires that members of Congress are chosen with equal representation for equal numbers of people. *Wesberry v. Sanders*, 376 U.S. 1, 7-8 (1963). This

[11] In relevant part, Article I, § 2 states: "[Congressional] Representatives ... shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according their respective Numbers. ..."

Constitutional mandate, commonly referred to as the one person-one vote principle, requires "that as nearly as is practicable one man's vote in a congressional election is to be worth as much as another's." *Id.* As the Supreme Court has explained:

> The "nearly as practicable" standard requires that the State make a good-faith effort to achieve precise mathematical equality. ... Unless population variances among congressional districts are shown to have resulted, despite such effort, the State must justify each variance, *no matter how small*.... [Article I, § 2, therefore] permits only the limited population variances which are unavoidable despite a good-faith effort to achieve absolute equality, or for which justification is shown."

Kirkpatrick v. Preisler, 394 U.S. 526, 530-31 (1969) (emphasis added).

Thus, in a challenge to a congressional redistricting plan, the plaintiff bears the initial burden of proving that the differences in district-to-district population could have been reduced or eliminated by "a good-faith effort to draw districts of equal population." *Karcher v. Daggett*, 462 U.S. 725, 730 (1983). If the plaintiffs can demonstrate that the differences in population were not the result of a good-faith effort to achieve equality in population between the various districts, then the State must prove that some legitimate reasons justifies the variances. *Id.* at 731.

Defendants argue that this claim should be dismissed because Plaintiffs have not offered a plan with smaller deviations, and Plaintiffs have not demonstrated that the deviations in Act 1 were unavoidable. According to Defendants, although there are variations in Act 1, they equal

0.00%. Therefore, "as a matter of law, the district populations are equal and there is no significant variance between districts to be explained." (Def. Pres. Offs. Br. in Sup. Mot. to Dis. at 8.) However, the Supreme Court has squarely rejected any *de minimis* exception to the requirement of absolute equality in population between districts. *Karcher*, 462 U.S. at 734 ("[T]here are no *de minimis* variations, which could practically be avoided, but which nonetheless meet the standard of Art. I, § 2 without justification.") "Article I, § 2, ... permits only the limited population variations which are unavoidable despite a good faith effort to achieve absolute equality, or for which justification is shown." *Id.* at 730. Contrary to Defendants' contention, the only variations which are per se excusable are those which are unavoidable. For example, Pennsylvania's population of 12,281,054 does not divide equally between its allotted nineteen districts. Therefore, if all of the districts under Act 1 had populations of 646,371 or 646,372, then the court could conclude that the differences in population were unavoidable and would not have to examine whether Act 1 was enacted in good faith.

However, according to Plaintiffs' allegations, this is simply not the case. District 7, the most populated district, has a population of 646,380, and Districts 1, 2, and 17, the least populated districts, have populations of 646,361; a maximum difference in population of nineteen. These variances, therefore, are not per se unavoidable. *See e.g. Anne Arundel County Republican Cent. Comm. v. State Admin. Bd. of Election Laws*, 781 F. Supp. 394, 395-96 (D. Md. 1991) (holding that a maximum deviation of ten between the most populated and the least populated districts does not satisfy Karcher's requirement of absolute equality). Plaintiffs also allege that Act 1's variances are not the result of a good-faith effort to achieve population parity, but rather

are part of a Republican plan to eliminate Democratic representatives from Congress. Additionally, Plaintiffs make several factual allegations that, if proven, would tend to undermine any justification Defendants might proffer in support of Act 1's population variances.

Defendants cite *Karcher* for the proposition that Plaintiffs must allege that a plan with smaller deviations was possible. The court finds that argument unpersuasive. In *Karcher*, the plaintiffs provided the court with an alternative plan as evidence that the challenged plan was not the result of a good-faith effort to achieve district population parity. 462 U.S. at 726. That case, however, had proceeded beyond the Rule 12(b)(6) stage. While Plaintiffs may have to provide such a plan in order to satisfy their ultimate burden of persuasion in this case, there is nothing in the *Karcher* decision indicating that such a plan must be alleged in the complaint. Plaintiffs, therefore, have pleaded a prima facie violation of the one person-one vote command of Article I, § 2. Accordingly, the court will deny Defendants' motion to dismiss Count I of Plaintiffs' amended complaint.

3. Equal Protection (Partisan Gerrymandering)

In *Davis v. Bandemer*, the Supreme Court first recognized that claims for violation of equal protection based on partisan gerry mandering present justiciable issues. 478 U.S. at 123-26. Although that holding commanded a majority, only a plurality of the court endorsed the standards setting out what constitutes such a violation. Where a fragmented Court decides a case and no single rationale earns the endorsement of five Justices, "the holding of the Court may be viewed as that position taken by those Members who concurred in the judgments on the narrowest grounds." *Gregg v. Georgia*, 428 U.S. 153, 169 n.15 (1976). Therefore, we may correctly view the plurality's analysis in

Bandemer as constituting the governing standards to be applied in this case. *Accord Pope v. Blue*, 809 F. Supp. 392, 395 (W.D.N.C. 1992); *Republican Party v. Wilder*, 774 F. Supp. 400, 403-04 (W.D. Va. 1991); *Badham v. Fong Eu*, 694 F. Supp. 664, 668 (N.D. Cal. 1988).

In *Bandemer*, a plurality of the Court held that a plaintiff, in order to succeed on an equal protection claim of partisan gerrymandering, must "prove both intentional discrimination against an identifiable political group and an actual discriminatory effect on that group." 478 U.S. at 127. With this standard in mind, we now examine Plaintiffs' amended complaint in order to determine whether they have alleged facts that, if proven, would constitute an equal protection violation.

a. Identifiable Political Group

Defendants initially argue that Plaintiffs have failed to allege facts that could establish that they are members of an identifiable political group. Specifically, Defendants contend that Plaintiffs have failed to allege facts demonstrating that Democrats in Pennsylvania vote as a block. However, Defendants do not point to any authority which would require such an allegation. The court has scoured the *Bandemer* decision and has found no such requirement. Instead, the court finds that *Bandemer* indicates that Plaintiffs must allege only that they are members of an identifiable political group whose geographical distribution is sufficiently ascertainable that it could have been used in drawing electoral district lines. Clearly, by alleging that they are Pennsylvanian citizens who vote for Democrats, Plaintiffs have satisfied this requirement.

b. Discriminatory Intent

Both parties appear to recognize that the intent requirement in this case has been met. As the *Bandemer* plurality pointed out, "as long as redistricting is done by a legislature, it should not be very difficult to prove that the likely political consequences of the reapportionment were intended." *Id.* at 128. In this case, Plaintiffs allegations – that the Republican majority in the Pennsylvania General Assembly prevented all Democratic input on Act 1 in order to establish a Republican super-majority in Pennsylvania's congressional caucus – are sufficient to satisfy their pleading requirement.

c. Actual Discriminatory Effects

The analysis as to the actual discriminatory effect is not nearly as simple. It appears that the effects analysis itself involves another two-pronged determination. First, Plaintiffs must prove an actual or projected history of disproportionate election results. Second, Plaintiffs must prove that "the electoral system is arranged in a manner that will consistently degrade a voter's, or group of voters', influence on the political process as a whole." *Id.* at 110. While Plaintiffs' allegations may be sufficient to satisfy the first requirement as a projection of disproportionate election results, they do not indicate that Plaintiffs have been, or will be, prevented from participating in the political process. Even assuming *arguendo* that Plaintiffs' allegations are true, the court will dismiss Plaintiffs' equal protection claim because Plaintiffs have not alleged facts indicating that as a result of Act 1 Plaintiffs will be completely shut out of the political process.

We begin our analysis by stating that the recondite standard enunciated in *Bandemer* offers little concrete

guidance. However, the result may assist us. In that case, Republicans enjoyed majorities in both houses of the state legislature, and the Governor was a Republican. Exploiting these majorities, the Republicans adopted a state legislature redistricting plan that heavily favored Republicans. The plaintiffs in *Bandemer* filed suit challenging the plan as a violation of equal protection. At trial before a three-judge panel, the plaintiffs presented the following evidence: (1) of the statewide votes cast in the elections for the State House of Representatives, Democratic candidates received 51.9% of the vote, but won only forty-three of the 100 seats available; (2) of the statewide votes cast in the elections for the State Senate, Democratic candidates received 53.1% of the vote, but won only thirteen of the twenty-five seats available; (3) in two counties where 46.6% of the voting population tended to vote Democrat on a regular basis, Republicans won 85% of the seats available – eighteen out of twenty-one; (4) the plan disregarded political subdivision boundaries defining communities of interest; and (5) the plan disregarded the one person-one vote imperative and the Voting Rights Act's no retrogression requirement. 478 U.S. at 116, 134. On this evidence, the panel held that the plan violated equal protection as a partisan gerrymandering.

A plurality of the Supreme Court, however, overturned that result. In doing so, the Court held that the evidence failed to establish that the redistricting plan had a sufficiently adverse impact on the Indiana Democrats to constitute a violation of the Equal Protection Clause. *Id.* at 129. Specifically, the Court stated that "the mere lack of proportional representation will not be sufficient to prove unconstitutional discrimination. Again, without specific supporting evidence, a court cannot presume in such a case that those who are elected will disregard the disproportionately underrepresented group." *Id.* at 130.

According to the Court, the plaintiffs failed to provide any such evidence and, therefore, failed to establish an equal protection violation.

The three-judge panel in *Badham v. Fong Eu*[12] applied the *Bandemer* standard and concluded that the plaintiffs there had not satisfied their burden of alleging that California's congressional redistricting plan resulted in Republicans being shut out of the political process as a whole. 694 F. Supp. at 670-71. In that case, an outgoing Democratic Governor colluded with the Democratic majority in the state legislature to pass a congressional redistricting plan that heavily favored Democratic candidates. In the first election held under that plan, Republicans received 50.1% of the vote statewide, but received only 40% of the congressional seats (eighteen of forty-five). The defendants filed a Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss. The panel granted the motion holding that the plaintiffs had failed to allege facts that, if proven, would demonstrate an actual discriminatory effect on Californian Republicans. The *Badham* panel focused its analysis on the effects the plan would have on California's political landscape as a whole.

---

[12] Although the Supreme Court did not grant *certiorari* to hear the *Badham* case, it did summarily affirm the three-judge panel's decision. *See Badham v. Eu*, 488 U.S. 1024 (1989). Unlike a denial of *certiorari*, a summary affirmation by the Supreme Court creates precedential authority binding on the lower courts. *See* 12 Moore's Federal Practice ¶ 400.05-1 (3d ed. 1999). This authority extends only to the judgment's result, and not the underlying reasoning. *Mandel v. Bradley*, 432 U.S. 173, 176 (1977). "Nevertheless, due in particular to the fact that the *Bandemer* Court was unable to agree on a majority opinion, we believe that the *Badham* court's interpretation of *Bandemer*, subsequently affirmed by the Supreme Court, is entitled to substantial deference." *Pope v. Blue*, 809 F. Supp. at 395 n.2.

It is on this second prong of the "effects" threshold that plaintiffs' complaint falters. Specifically, there are no factual allegations regarding California Republicans' role in the political process as a whole. ... There are no allegations that California Republicans have been "shut out" of the political process, nor are there allegations that anyone has ever interfered with Republican registration, organizing, voting, fund-raising, or campaigning. Republicans remain free to speak out on issues of public concern; plaintiffs do not allege that there are, or have been, any impediments to their full participation in the uninhibited, robust, and wide-open public debate on which our political system relies....

Particularly conspicuous by its absence is any allegation that plaintiffs' interests are being entirely ignored by their congressional representatives. ... Instead, plaintiffs claim that Democratic incumbents will be reelected without need to attend to the views of fragmented and submerged Republican minorities in their districts. . . Nowhere do plaintiffs suggest that they can prove disregard by any means other than by inference from the election results, a method which *Bandemer* removes from our purview.

Badham, 694 F. Supp. at 670-71 (internal quotations omitted).

In this case, Plaintiffs' allegations amount to this; Act 1 is rigged to guarantee that thirteen of Pennsylvania's nineteen congressional representatives will be Republicans. As a result, Democrats will have a more difficult time electing their candidates. Due to this impediment, "the Democratic Party will have greater difficulty in fielding competitive candidates." (Amd. Compl. at ¶ 35.) Thus, Act 1

operates "to essentially shut Democrats and Democratic voters out of the political process." (*Id.* at ¶ 36.) Plaintiffs, in particular, "will suffer harm ... [because they] will now be increasingly represented by members of Congress who do not represent their views." (*Id.* at 37.)

As *Bandemer* and *Badham* dictate, these allegations are insufficient to make out a cause of action for violation of equal protection. First, Plaintiffs' allegation that Republicans will earn a super-majority of the congressional representatives despite their status as a minority party statewide is simply an argument for proportional representation. However, *Bandemer* soundly rejected such a basis for an equal protection violation. *See* 478 U.S. at 130 ("Our cases, however, clearly foreclose any claim that the Constitution requires proportional representation or that legislatures in reapportioning must draw district lines to come as near as possible to allocating seats to the contending parties in proportion to what their anticipated statewide vote will be.")

Second, *Bandemer* was equally forceful in rejecting the presumption that voters who vote for losing candidates will not be adequately represented. *See id.* at 132 ("An individual or a group of individuals who votes for a losing candidate is usually deemed to be adequately represented by the winning candidate and has as much opportunity to influence that candidate as other voters in the district."). Therefore, Plaintiffs' allegation that they will be represented in Congress by Republicans who do not share their views bears no weight in our analysis.

Third, Plaintiffs' allegations that, due to Act 1, the Democratic party will have a greater difficulty in fielding competitive candidates is irrelevant. The focus in our inquiry is on the effect that the redistricting plan will have on an

identifiable political group. In this case, as previously stated, that group is Pennsylvania Democratic *voters*. Therefore, the focus is on the effect Act 1 will have on the voters' ability to participate in the political process, not the Democratic party's health in Pennsylvania. The Constitution protects against partisan gerrymandering only because of the effect that it has on the individual's ability to exercise the fundamental right to vote. It goes without saying that political parties, although the principal players in the political process, do not have the right to vote. Therefore, their health is a non-issue in the constitutional analysis. Stripped to its bones, Plaintiffs' allegations, in this respect, amount to a claim that Act 1 will make it more difficult for them to elect Democratic candidates to Congress. However, this simply is not the end-all be-all constitutional analysis that Plaintiffs make it out to be.

> [T]he mere fact that a particular apportionment scheme makes it more difficult for a particular group in a particular district to elect representatives of its choice does not render that scheme constitutionally infirm. This conviction, in turn, stems from a perception that the power to influence the political process is not limited to winning elections. . . . Thus, a group's electoral power is not unconstitutionally diminished by the simple fact of an apportionment scheme makes winning elections more difficult, and a failure of proportional representation alone does not constitute impermissible discrimination under the Equal Protection Clause.

Id. at 131-32.

Finally, we find that Plaintiffs' allegations do not indicate that Act 1 "essentially shuts ... Democratic voters out of the political process." (Amend. Compl. at ¶ 36.) While

Plaintiffs employ this phrase in their complaint, these words do not have the talismanic effect of converting Act 1 into an actionable constitutional violation. *See Morse v. Lower Merion Sch. Dist.*, 132 F.3d 902, 906 (3d Cir. 1997) (holding that when deciding a Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss, the court must treat a plaintiff's allegations as true, but need not give such credence to legal conclusions). While Plaintiffs allege that Democratic members of the Pennsylvania General Assembly were shut out of the redistricting process, there are no allegations that anyone has ever prevented, or will ever prevent, Plaintiffs from: registering to vote; organizing with other like-minded voters; raising funds on behalf of candidates; voting; campaigning; or speaking out on matters of public concern. *See Badham*, 694 F. Supp. at 670. Act 1 simply does not address such issues. In short, "Plaintiffs do not allege that there are, or ever have been, any impediments to their full participation in the 'uninhibited, robust, wide-open' public debate on which our political system relies." *Id.* (quoting *New York Times v. Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254, 270 (1964)).

In summation, Plaintiffs have not alleged facts indicating that they have been shut out of the political process and, therefore, they cannot establish an actual discriminatory effect on them. Because the court holds that Plaintiffs' allegations are insufficient to pass the threshold effects analysis, the court will dismiss that portion of the complaint alleging that Act 1 violates the Equal Protection Clause.

4. Privileges and Immunities

In Count III of the amended complaint, Plaintiffs assert that Act 1 violates their rights pursuant to the Privileges and

Immunities Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.[13] However, the Third Circuit has recognized that "the Privileges and Immunities Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment has 'remained essentially moribund' since the Supreme Court's decision in *The Slaughter-House Cases*, 83 U.S. (16 Wall.) 36 (1872), and the Supreme Court has subsequently relied almost exclusively on the Due Process Clause as the source of unenumerated rights." *In re Sacred Heart Hosp.*, 133 F.3d 237, 244 (3d Cir. 1997).

Plaintiffs, though, argue that Act 1 "grants Republicans their right to be free of a district that does not impermissibly burden their rights to an undiluted vote, but it denies that right to Democrats." (Pls. Br. in Opp. Mot. to Dis. at 20.) Therefore, according to Plaintiffs, there must be some legitimate governmental purpose for Defendants' actions. In support for this contention, Plaintiffs rely entirely upon *Saenz v. Roe*, 526 U.S. 489 (1999). In *Saenz*, the Court held unconstitutional a California statute that limited the welfare benefits of new residents during their first year of residency in that state. The statute, the Court reasoned, violated the fundamental right of citizens to travel from state to state. In making this determination, the Court held that the statute violated the third element of the right to travel -- the right of the newly-arrived citizen to enjoy the same privileges and immunities "enjoyed by other citizens of the same State." *Id.* at 502.

Plaintiffs, however, do not explain how the right to travel, which apparently is protected in some part by the Privileges and Immunities Clause, translates into a right to

[13] In relevant part, the Fourteenth Amendment reads: "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States. . . ." U.S. Const. amend. XIV, § 1.

have proportional representation with Republican voters. Simply put, the Privileges and Immunities Clause, which protects against discrimination on the basis of state citizenship, has nothing to do with this case. In this case, there are no allegations that Plaintiffs are newly-arrived citizens of Pennsylvania or that they are citizens of other states. In fact, the amended complaint clearly states that both Plaintiffs and Defendants are citizens of Pennsylvania. (*See* Amd. Compl. at ¶¶ 2-5.) Because Plaintiffs have failed to allege a cause of action for violation of the Privileges and Immunities Clause, the court will dismiss Count III of the amended complaint.

5. First Amendment

In Count IV of the amended complaint, Plaintiffs assert that Act 1 violates their right to free association as guaranteed to them by the First Amendment. The gravamen of Plaintiffs' claim is that Act 1 constitutes a governmental classification based on political affiliation and, thus, violates their right to free association.

It is well established that the "First Amendment protects political association as well as political expression." *Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1, 15 (1976). However, Plaintiffs fail to explain how Act 1 penalizes them for their exercise of First Amendment rights. Instead, Plaintiffs try to analogize their claim to a ballot access denial or a denial of the right to vote. However, nowhere in Plaintiffs' amended complaint do they allege that Act 1 prevents them from voting or having access to the ballot. Instead, Plaintiffs imply that Act 1 makes it more difficult for them to exercise these rights.

It is true that the First Amendment guarantees participation in the political process. However, as the legion of case law and common sense dictate, it does not guarantee that such participation will be successful. *Accord Republican*

Party v Martin, 980 F.2d 943, 960 (4th Cir. 1992); *Pope v. Blue*, 809 F. Supp. at 398; *Badham*, 694 F. Supp. at 675. "Because there is 'no device that directly inhibits participation in the political process,' [Plaintiffs'] freedom of association claim boils down to the argument that they are entitled to political success." *Pope*, 809 F. Supp. at 398. This is a right which the Constitution does not guarantee. Therefore, we hold that the Plaintiffs' freedom of association claim is coextensive with their equal protection claim. *Accord Id.* As discussed above, *see supra*. Part II.B.3, Plaintiffs have not stated a claim for a recognized violation of the Fourteenth Amendment. Therefore, the court will dismiss Plaintiffs' claim in Count IV for failure to state a claim for violation of their First Amendment right to free association.

6. 42 U.S.C. § 1983

In Count V, Plaintiffs assert a claim based on violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983. However, as previously stated, *see supra*. at 536, n.6, "§ 1983 does not create substantive rights but 'merely redresses the deprivation of ... rights. . . created by the Constitution or federal statute.'" *Ridgewood Bd. of Educ. v. N.E. for M.E.*, 178 F.3d 238, 251-52 (3d. Cir. 1999) (quoting *W.B. v. Matula*, 67 F.3d 484, 493 (3d Cir. 1995)). Accordingly, the court has construed Plaintiffs' amended complaint as an action brought pursuant to § 1983 to vindicate their rights under the Constitution. Therefore, to the extent that Plaintiffs seek an independent basis for recovery, Count V will be dismissed.

7. Relief Sought

Finally, Defendants contend that the remainder of Plaintiffs' complaint must be dismissed because the court cannot grant the type of relief which Plaintiffs request. Specifically, Defendants rely upon *Growe v. Emison*, 507

U.S. 25, 34 (1993), for the proposition that the court is without power to create a new redistricting plan. That is, even if the court determines that Act 1 is unconstitutional, we must defer to the State legislature or judicial system to create a new plan. However, the court need not address that issue at this time. Plaintiffs request that the court grant a declaratory judgment that Act 1 violates the one person-one vote requirement of Article I. Clearly, the court has the remedial power to issue such a declaratory judgment.

III. Conclusion

As to Defendant Executive Officers' motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, the court will grant that motion in part and will deny it in part. The court will grant the motion as to Defendant Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, which will be dismissed from the suit on the basis of Eleventh Amendment sovereign immunity. The court, however, will deny the motion in all other respects. Because the court finds that Plaintiffs have standing to sue, the court will deny Defendant Presiding Officers' motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Additionally, as to the motions to dismiss for failure to state a claim, the court will grant both motions in part and deny both motions in part. The court holds that Plaintiffs have alleged a valid cause of action for violation of the one person-one vote requirement of Article I. Accordingly, the motions will be denied as to Count I of the amended complaint. However, the court will grant the motion as to Counts II, III, IV and V. An appropriate order will issue.

Dated: February 22, 2002.

ORDER

In accordance with the accompanying memorandum of law, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT**:

(1) Defendant Executive Officers' motion to dismiss pursuant to Rule 12(b)(1) is **GRANTED IN PART** and **DENIED IN PART**, as follows:

(A) As to Defendant Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the motion is **GRANTED**, all claims against the Commonwealth are dismissed;

(B) In all other respects, the motion is **DENIED**;

(2) Defendant Presiding Officers' motion to dismiss pursuant to Rule 12(b)(1) is **DENIED**;

(3) Defendant Executive Officers' motion to dismiss pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) is **GRANTED IN PART** and **DENIED IN PART**, as follows:

(A) The motion is **GRANTED** as to Counts II, III, IV and V of the amended complaint;

(B) The motion is **DENIED** as to Count I of the amended complaint;

(4) Defendant Presiding Officers' motion to dismiss pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) is **GRANTED IN PART** and **DENIED IN PART**, as follows:

(A) The motion is **GRANTED** as to Counts II, III, IV and V of the amended complaint;

(B) The motion is **DENIED** as to Count I of the amended complaint.

/s/ Richard L. Nygaard
United States Circuit Judge

/s/ William H. Yohn, Jr.
United States District Judge

/s/ Sylvia H. Rambo
United States District Judge

Dated: February 22, 2002

Appendix C

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

RICHARD VIETH, NORMA JEAN VIETH, and SUSAN FUREY, Plaintiffs v. COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, *et al.*, Defendants

CIVIL NO. 1:CV-01-2439

April 8, 2002, Decided

April 8, 2002, Filed

OPINION AND ORDER OF THE COURT

PER CURIAM

In our previous order of February 22, 2002, we dismissed several claims brought by the Plaintiffs which challenged the constitutionality of Pennsylvania Senate Bill 1200 (Act 1), the congressional redistricting plan enacted by the General Assembly and signed into law on January 7, 2002. On March 11-12, 2002, we held a hearing on the Plaintiff's sole remaining claim: Act 1 violates the constitutional principle of "one-person, one vote." Upon conclusion of this hearing, we ordered the parties to file proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law.

I. Background

The 2000 Census reported that Pennsylvania's total population was 12,291,054 persons. As a result of this population figure, and in accordance with Article I, Section 2 and the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States

Constitution, Pennsylvania's congressional delegation was reduced from twenty-one to nineteen representatives in Congress.[1]

The loss of two congressional seats made it necessary to increase the size of the existing districts by approximately 100,000 persons. Additionally, because of shifts in population, some congressional districts were over-populated while some were well under the ideal population. Therefore, significant changes were made to the existing congressional districts.

Pennsylvania Senate Bill 1200 was introduced by Senators Brightbill and Lemmond on November 16, 2001. Senators Brightbill and Lemmond are members of the Republican Party. A competing plan, Senate Bill 1241 was introduced by Democratic state senators Mellow, O'Pake, Wagner, Musto, Kasunic, Fumo and Stout. On December 10, 2001, the Senate considered amendments to Senate Bill 1200. A Republican amendment was ultimately agreed to. The version of Senate Bill 1200 that eventually passed the Senate contained a population deviation of twenty-four persons.

After an amendment by the Pennsylvania House of Representatives, that chamber passed Senate Bill 1200 on December 12, 2001. The version of Senate Bill 1200 that passed the House had a total population deviation of nineteen

---

[1] Article I, Section 2 states in pertinent part: "The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the People of the several States, and the Electors of each State shall have Qualification requisite for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State Legislature." U.S. Const. art I, § 2. Section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment states in pertinent part: "Representatives shall be apportioned among the several states according to their representative numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each state." U.S. Const. amend. XIV, § 2.

persons.[2] It also maintained two minority-majority districts in the Philadelphia area, created one open seat in the southeastern part of the Commonwealth and paired two Democratic incumbents in the same district. One Democratic incumbent was paired against one Republican incumbent.

The Senate refused to concur in the amendments to Senate Bill 1200 offered by the House of Representatives. A Conference Committee was appointed and a plan was eventually devised that contained a nineteen person deviation. This Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1200 was passed by the Senate on January 3, 2002 and by the House of Representatives later the same day. It was signed into law on January 7, 2002.

In its final form, Act 1 created nineteen congressional districts with a total population deviation of nineteen. Although Act 1 did maintain two "minority-majority" districts in Philadelphia, it created three districts in which six incumbent congressman would have to run for re-election against each other. Of these pairings, two of the districts required Democratic congressmen to run against each other and one district required an incumbent Democratic representative to run against an incumbent Republican representative. These pairings of incumbent congressman permitted the creation of an open congressional district in the southeastern part of the Commonwealth. In contrast to its treatment of Democratic incumbents, no Republican congressmen are forced to run against each other.

Moreover, Act 1 splits eighty-four local governments, including twenty-five counties, fifty-nine cities, boroughs or

---

[2] The term "deviation" as used in this opinion refers to the differences in population between the least and most populated districts under the redistricting plan.

townships, as well as forty-one wards. It also splits six voting precincts.

II. Analysis

A. Population Deviation

The United States Constitution requires that each congressional district in a state contain equal population. *See Wesberry v. Sanders*, 376 U.S. 1, 18 (1864) (holding that Art. I, § 2 of the Constitution requires that "as nearly as is practicable one man's vote in a congressional election is to be worth as much as another's."). The Supreme Court has been exceedingly clear in requiring lower courts to balance population among the districts with precision. *See Karcher v. Daggett*, 462 U.S. 725, 734 (1983) ("there are no *de minimis* population variations, which could practicably be avoided, but which nonetheless meet the standard of Art. I, § 2 without justification."); *Kirkpatrick v. Preisler*, 394 U.S. 526, 531 (1969) ("The 'as nearly as practicable' standard requires that the State make a good-faith effort to achieve precise mathematical equality. Unless population variances among congressional districts are shown to have resulted despite such effort, the State must justify each variance, no matter how small."). In a challenge to a congressional redistricting plan, the plaintiff bears the burden of proving that the differences in district-to-district population could have been reduced or eliminated altogether by a "good-faith effort to draw districts of equal population." *Karcher*, 462 U.S. at 730.

We find that the Plaintiffs have met their burden in this case. First, it is undisputed that Act 1 has a deviation in population of nineteen persons between the most populated and least populated districts. Therefore, unless these deviations were unavoidable or resulted despite a good faith effort to draw districts of equal population, then the

Defendants must prove a legitimate justification for the deviations. The evidence conclusively demonstrates that this population deviation was avoidable. Plaintiffs presented into evidence "Alternative Plan 4" which had a minimum possible deviation – districts that differ by only one person. Additionally, this plan achieves zero deviation without splitting any precincts among congressional districts and splits fewer municipalities than Act 1. Witnesses presented by both parties testified that it would have been relatively easy to take any plan or map and reach a point of zero population deviation.[3] Indeed, the Defendants themselves

[3] The Defendants suggest that "Alternative Plan 4" cannot be considered because it was never before the legislature. They argue that Plaintiffs must meet their burden under the first prong of the *Karcher* test only by relying on maps and/or redistricting plans that have a lower population deviation than the one enacted and that were presented to the legislature. We disagree. Although in *Karcher*, the legislature had before it other plans with less deviation, the Court never endorsed such a requirement. Instead, the Court focused on whether a plan with less deviation was possible. In this case, the Plaintiffs have provided four plans that had less deviations than Act 1. If we were to adopt the limited analysis suggested by the Defendants, we would be adopting a view that would isolate grossly disproportionate plans from constitutional scrutiny on the sole basis that such plans constitute the plan with the least deviations *available*. *Karcher* is wrought with references indicating that the least deviation *possible* is that which should govern the analysis. *See* 462 U.S. at 727 (affirming the three-judge panel's conclusion that the New Jersey plan violated the one-person, one-vote requirement "because the population deviations among districts, although small, were not the result of good-faith effort to achieve *population equality*) (emphasis added); 462 U.S. at 732-33 (stating that the Court requires that "*absolute population equality* be the paramount objective of apportionment ... in the case of congressional districts," but not necessarily for other forms of redistricting) (emphasis added); 462 U.S. at 730 (stating that under the first prong of the analysis "the court must consider whether the population differences among districts could have been reduced or eliminated altogether by a good-faith effort to draw districts of *equal*

submitted a map with zero population deviation. Thus, the nineteen person deviation in Act 1 was avoidable.

Nor can the deviation contained in Act 1 be excused based upon the good faith of the Defendants. Indeed, we find that the testimony of defense witness Dr. John Memmi satisfies the Plaintiff's burden here. Dr. Memmi testified that he was in charge of drawing up the map that became Act 1. He further stated that he drew the map under the direct supervision of the Republican leadership. He began manipulating the map in order to get the deviations lower. However, once he reached the point of a nineteen-person deviation, he was told to stop manipulating the map:

> Q: Actually, what I would like to know is if there was a number that anybody said you could stop once you got to number nineteen or number 18?
>
> A: Every move that was made was done under the supervision of my supervisors. And at the time, the team involved the House Republican Caucus Redistricting crew, some members thereof, the Senate Republican Caucus Redistricting team, members thereof. And the Supervisors sat there while Bill Shower and I – Bill is a gentleman with the House Republican Caucus. They observed every census block move that we made. And we continued to make moves, and were monitoring the overall range. I should say we all monitored it, of

population") (emphasis added); 462 U.S. at 731 ("Adopting any standard other than *population equality*, using the best census data available ... would subtly erode the Constitution's ideal of *equal representation*.") (emphasis added). In this case, the evidence indicates that a zero-deviation map was possible, and thus should govern our analysis under *Karcher's* first prong.

> course, but the supervisor's the one whose monitoring counted. And when the districts were at nineteen overall range, they said that is sufficient.

Tr. Vol 3 at page 276. No other witnesses were called by the Defendants to explain why Dr. Memmi was told to stop manipulating the map.

We find this testimony to be in clear violation of the Supreme Court's express goal of getting as close as possible to zero deviation when drawing congressional districts. *See Karcher*, 462 U.S. at 734. Therefore, we find that the Defendants did not put forth a good-faith effort to draw districts of equal population.

It has been suggested that the deviation from absolute numerical equality present in Act 1 is too trivial or minute to rise to a constitutionally significant level. While it is true that the deviation contained in Act 1 is small, *Karcher* specifically holds that "there are no *de minimis* variations which could practically be avoided, but nonetheless meet the standard of Art. I, § 2 without justification." 462 U.S. at 734. Thus, we hold that the population deviation in Act 1, even though relatively small, enables the Plaintiffs to satisfy *Karcher's* first prong and shifts to the Defendants the burden of proving justification.

B. Justification

Because the Plaintiffs have met their burden under *Karcher*, the Defendants must now prove that this population deviation was "necessary to achieve some legitimate goal." 462 U.S. at 731 (*citing Kirkpatrick*, 394 U.S. at 530; *Swann v. Adams*, 385 U.S. 440, 443-444 (1967)). While *Karcher* did not specify how the State might meet its burden in step two, it did give several examples of legislative policies that might justify some variance among the populations of the State's

various congressional districts. Specifically, the Court stated that "making districts compact, respecting municipal boundaries, preserving the cores of prior districts and avoiding contests between incumbent Representatives" may legitimate minor population deviations among congressional districts. The Court also made clear that the burden borne by the State varies inversely with the magnitude of the population deviation. 462 U.S. at 741. That is, the greater the deviation, the more compelling the government's justification must be.

Defendants contend that the population variances in Act 1 are justified by a desire to avoid splitting voting precincts.[4] Both parties agree that splitting precincts creates additional costs and work for county election officials in acquiring voting machines, in customizing ballots, in training precincts officials, in registering voters and in counting ballots. Moreover, we recognize that split precincts increase the potential for voter disorientation and candidate confusion. Therefore, to the extent that such justification is genuine, we acknowledge that the desire to avoid splitting precincts is a legitimate state interest which could justify a nineteen person deviation.

We find, however, that the Defendants' arguments on this point are a mere pretext. Specifically, the evidence has demonstrated that it is possible to draw a congressional district map with zero deviation and no precinct splits. Plaintiffs' witness, Robert Priest, drew exactly such a map using the same tools as Dr. Memmi. However, unlike Dr.

---

[4] While the Defendants have suggested various other state interests which may have justified Act 1, since the focus of our inquiry in the justification phase is population deviation, the only justification submitted which deals with that issue is the policy objective of limiting voter precinct splits. Therefore, we will confine our analysis to this issue.

Memmi, Mr. Priest was free to draw the map by manipulating entire precincts from district-to-district in order to achieve absolute population equality. As we have previously pointed out, Dr. Memmi testified that he was more constrained by his superiors. According to that testimony, Dr. Memmi initially formulated three congressional districts of ideal population by manipulating entire precincts. However, at that point, he was instructed to stop using whole precincts and to begin using census blocks to lower the deviation. Because every voting precinct contains several census blocks, manipulation of the census blocks leads almost inextricably to splitting precincts. We also note that none of the congressional districts that have split precincts have an ideal population.

Dr. Memmi was equally restrained in his efforts to bring Act 1 down to a zero deviation. That is, his superiors in the Republican caucus instructed him that he was only to manipulate census blocks and not precincts. This wholesale reliance on the census block method – the lone cause of the precinct splits – is what Defendants now employ to justify the deviations in their map. The logical inconsistency is so deep that it causes us to pause and consider the sincerity of such proffer. If Defendants truly wanted to avoid splitting precincts, they would have done so by enacting a zero deviation map that did not split *any* precincts.

Moreover, it is worth noting that of the maps presented at trial, Act 1 is that which least comports with the neutral legislative policies that the *Karcher* Court stated would justify a Congressional redistricting plan with some deviations. Act 1 is the plan which contains the least compact districts. (Pls. Ex. 12 at 7.) Act 1 splits the most counties (twenty-five) and municipalities (fifty-nine cities,

townships, or boroughs).[5] (*Id.*) With the exception of Act 1's twin, the zero-deviation version, Act 1 even splits the most precincts. (*Id.*) To the extent that Act 1 retains the cores of prior districts, it does so only for districts containing Republican incumbents. (*See id.* at 8.)

However, it is on Karcher's final endorsed neutral criteria – the avoidance of contests between incumbents – that Act 1 fails most miserably. Although Pennsylvania's loss of two congressional seats requires the pairing of only two sets of incumbents in the 2002 elections, Act 1 pits six incumbents against each other: two pairs of Democrats, and one Republican against one Democrat (the latter in a district that heavily favors Republican candidates). At the same time Act 1 pits more incumbents than necessary against one another, it also creates a new district, District 6, in which no incumbent resides. In the face of such evidence, it is clear that Karcher's neutral criteria were not high on the priority list in enacting Act 1.

The dissent suggests that our analysis should pay deference to the policies that Act 1 reflects. However, there is no legal authority to support the corollary assertion that the only relevant zero-deviation maps with no precinct splits are those which comport with the general contours of Act 1.

In summation, it has been conclusively proven that it is possible to draw a congressional district map with zero population deviation amongst districts without splitting any precincts. Therefore, Defendants cannot rely on a general desire to avoid splitting precincts as a legitimate justification for a map that splits six such precincts. Put another way, if it

---

[5] In comparison, the now defunct 1992 Plan, which contained twenty-one congressional districts, split only eighteen counties and thirteen municipalities.

is possible to achieve a zero deviation map with no precinct splits by manipulating whole precincts, the actions of the Defendants in switching to census block data call into question the legitimacy of their proffered justifications. We find, therefore, that the Defendants have failed to provide any legitimate justification for the population deviations contained in Act 1. As such, we enjoin the implementation of Act 1.

III. Remedy

Having determined that Act 1 is unconstitutional, we now address the question of the appropriate remedy. The Supreme Court has cautioned that "reapportionment is primarily a matter for legislative consideration and determination, and that judicial relief becomes appropriate only when a legislature fails to reapportion according to federal constitutional requisites in a timely fashion after having had an adequate opportunity to do so." *White v. Weiser*, 412 U.S. 783 (1973). We recognize that the Pennsylvania General Assembly has primary jurisdiction over congressional redistricting. Furthermore, no evidence was presented that would permit us to conclude that the General Assembly would be unable to enact a new constitutional redistricting plan in time for the 2002 elections. This is not a case where the respective legislative bodies are hopelessly deadlocked and the likelihood is that they will be able to enact a constitutionally sound plan.

Therefore, the Defendants are ordered to submit a constitutionally sound redistricting plan that has been enacted into law by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to this court within three weeks of the date of this opinion.

An appropriate order will follow.

ORDER

In accordance with the preceding opinion, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT**:

(1) Plaintiffs' request for declaratory judgment is **GRANTED**. Act 1 is hereby declared unconstitutional as a violation of Article I, § 2 of the United States Constitution;

(2) Plaintiffs' request for injunctive relief is **GRANTED IN PART** as follows:

(A) To the extent that Plaintiffs request that the court enjoin Act 1's implementation, Plaintiffs' request is **GRANTED**. Defendants are permanently enjoined from implementing Act 1;

(B) To the extent that Plaintiffs request that the court devise its own redistricting plan for use in the 2002 congressional elections, Plaintiffs' request is **deferred pending compliance by the Pennsylvania General Assembly with this order**; and instead,

(3) The Pennsylvania General Assembly shall, within three weeks of the date of this order, prepare, enact and submit for review and final approval by this Court, a congressional redistricting plan in conformity with this opinion.

This Court shall retain jurisdiction pending issuance of a final order in this matter.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Richard L. Nygaard
United States Circuit Judge

/s/ Sylvia H. Rambo
United States District Judge

Dated: April 8, 2002.

YOHN, DISTRICT JUDGE, DISSENTING:

I agree with majority that the plaintiffs have met the first prong of the *Karcher* test and that the appropriate remedy, if Act 1 is unconstitutional, is to give the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania a reasonable period of time to enact a constitutionally sound redistricting plan.

I respectfully dissent, however, from Section II.B. of the majority opinion and conclude that defendants have met their burden, although just barely, to establish a justification for the nineteen person maximum deviation, and that Act 1 therefore passes constitutional muster.

In *Karcher v. Daggett*, 462 U.S. 725 (1983), the Court stated that the plaintiffs' "success in proving that the Feldman Plan was not the product of a good faith effort to achieve population equality means only that the burden shifted to the state to prove that the population deviations in its plan were necessary to achieve some legitimate state objective." (emphasis added). 462 U.S. at 740. Thus, the focus of the second prong of the *Karcher* test is the state's justification for the population deviations in Act 1.[6]

---

[6] The majority correctly points out that the Court has "made clear that the burden borne by the state varies inversely with the magnitude of the population deviation. . . . That is, the greater the deviation, the more compelling the government's justification must be." It would seem therefore that a nineteen person deviation in a congressional district of 646,371 or 646,372 would require a justification on the lowest end of the "justification" scale.

The defendants have pointed to a litany of state interests behind Act 1; however, since the focus of our inquiry in the justification phase of the *Karcher* analysis is the population deviation, the only justification submitted which deals with that issue is the policy objective of limiting voter precinct splits. Defendants contend that Act 1 could be "zeroed-out" by using Modification One but that this would entail splitting twenty-six voting precincts rather than the split of six voting precincts in Act 1.

Both parties agree that splitting precincts creates additional costs and work for county election officials in acquiring voting machines, in customizing ballots, in training precinct officials, in registering voters and in counting ballots. In addition, it increases the potential for voter confusion and candidate confusion. Thus, the desire to minimize the splitting of voting precincts is a legitimate justification, particularly when the overall population deviation is only nineteen.

The evidence with reference to this justification is, however, minimal. Dr. John Memmi testified that he was the cartographer who worked on the final draft of what became Act 1. When he reached the population deviation of nineteen he was told by his superiors that he could stop work. Inexplicably, neither party asked Dr. Memmi who told him this or called as a witness the person who told him to stop work in order to explore the basis for the decision. As a result, we are left to draw inferences from the evidence presented.

Defendants ask us to draw the inference that the effort to equalize population was halted because of a desire not to split any more voting precincts. There are 9,427 voting precincts in Pennsylvania but there are 322,424 census blocks. Act 1 as enacted contained six voting precinct splits.

(Defendants' exhibit 92). Subsequent to the enactment of Act 1 Dr. Memmi made further adjustments of census blocks in order to produce a plan with a zero population deviation. Using census blocks inevitably leads to more voter precinct splits and the resulting plan, designated as Modification One contains twenty-six voting precinct splits. (Defendants' exhibit 90).

This inference is also supported by the testimony of Dr. Memmi concerning the conversation when he was working on the last draft of what became Act 1 and told that he could stop work.

> Q Did they tell you why they thought that was sufficient?
>
> A They did not specifically say John, Bill, these are the reasons why we are stopping at 19. I don't mean to be curt.
>
> One of the prevailing themes throughout the exercise was to minimize the number of precinct incursions. We were at six. I worked with individuals who understand the election process. They understand the administration at the county level.
>
> I do not profess to have any more than at best a superficial understanding of that. But the concern was to minimize the number of precinct incursions so that election administration would be as smooth as it could be.

R. at 320 - 21.

Finally, I note that neither party has, even with the benefit of hindsight, submitted a plan following the general

contours of Act 1 which does not involve the splitting of more than six voting precincts. Thus, I find that the inference defendants suggest, that the justification for Act 1 is the reduced number of voting precinct splits, is reasonable.

Plaintiffs, on the other hand, ask us to infer that the Act 1 plan was not "zeroed out" because of partisan considerations. Plaintiffs produced a map that was "zeroed out" without splitting any voting precincts, Alternative Four. However, this plan does not follow the general contours of Act 1. The Court has oftentimes reminded us of the necessity not to override state goals, policies and preferences any more than is necessary. *See Abrams v. Johnson*, 521 U.S. 74, 101 (1997); *Upham v. Seamon*, 456 U.S. 37, 41-42 (1982); *White v. Weiser*, 412 U.S. 783, 795 (1973). There is no evidence to support a conclusion that Alternative Four encompasses the many other state goals, policies and preferences inherent in Act 1 which resulted in its enactment. In addition, plaintiffs have suggested no connection between the nineteen person deviation in Act 1 and the alleged partisanship of the plan. Indeed, any such suggestion is contradicted by Dr. Memmi's specific testimony that when he was trying to reduce the plan to the minimal population deviation possible on December 31, 2001, nobody expressed any concern that continuing to trade whole precincts might change the political characteristics of some of the districts and that during the entire procedure there was no commentary of a political nature. R. at 322. Moreover, to the extent that the plaintiffs are arguing partisan gerrymandering, the *Karcher* Court noted that "beyond requiring states to justify population deviations with explicit, precise reasons, which might be expected to have some inhibitory effect, *Kirkpatrick* does little to prevent what is known as gerrymandering. . . . *Kirkpatrick's* object, achieving population equality, is far less ambitious than what would be required to address

gerrymandering on a constitutional level." *Karcher*, 462 U.S. at 734 n.6. Thus, the inference which the plaintiffs ask us to draw is not supported by the evidence, by reason, or by law.

I conclude, therefore, that the nineteen person deviation was justified by the "legitimate state objective" of avoiding further splitting of voter precincts and that there has been no proof that the population deviation of nineteen persons bore any relationship to the alleged partisanship of Act 1. Thus, Act 1 is not unconstitutional.

/s/ William H. Yohn, Jr.
United States District Judge

Appendix D

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

JOANN ERFER and JEFFREY B. ALBERT, Petitioners
v.
THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA; MARK S. SCHWEIKER, in his official capacity as Governor of Pennsylvania; KIM PIZZINGRILLI, in her official capacity as Secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; RICHARD FILLING, in his official capacity as Commissioner of the Bureau of Commissions, Elections, and Legislation of the Pennsylvania Department of State; ROBERT C. JUBELIRER, in his official capacity as Lieutenant Governor of Pennsylvania and President of the Pennsylvania Senate; MATTHEW J. RYAN, in his official capacity as Speaker of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives, Respondents

14 MM 2002

March 15, 2002, Filed

OPINION

MR. JUSTICE CAPPY

This opinion is filed in support of the per curiam order of this court dated February 15, 2002. That order dismissed the state constitutional law claims raised in Joann Erfer and Jeffrey Albert's Petition for Review.

This matter concerns the General Assembly's plan redrawing federal congressional districts to comport with the results of the 2000 Census. See Act No. 2002-1 ("Act 1").

Joann Erfer and Jeffrey Albert ("Petitioners") filed a Petition for Review with the Commonwealth Court on January 10, 2002, raising federal and state constitutional law challenges to Act 1. In light of the fact that February 19, 2002 is the opening date and March 12, 2002 is the closing date for the circulation and filing of nomination petitions for the 2002 elections, Petitioners also requested that the Commonwealth Court expedite its consideration of this matter.

On January 22, 2002, the Commonwealth Court, however, scheduled to hear this matter on March 13, 2002, one day after the closing date for the circulation and filing of nomination petitions. On January 25, 2002, Petitioners filed an emergency Application with this court, requesting that we exercise plenary jurisdiction over this matter and set an expedited hearing schedule. Notably, they requested that only their Pennsylvania Constitutional law claims be resolved on an expedited basis. We granted plenary jurisdiction and remanded this matter with the directive that the Commonwealth Court's findings of fact and conclusions of law should be filed with this court by February 8, 2002.

The Honorable Dante Pellegrini of the Commonwealth Court promptly held hearings in this matter. While Petitioners raised several state constitutional law claims, they focused primarily on their claim that the legislature engaged in unconstitutional political gerrymandering in drawing up Act 1 in violation of the equal protection guarantee, Pa. Const. art. 1, §§ 1 and 26, and the free and equal elections clause, Pa. Const. art. 1, § 5. Petitioners acknowledged that based on voter registration figures, Act 1 grants rough parity to the two dominant political parties. See Pellegrini's Recommended Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, dated February 8, 2002, (hereinafter "Pellegrini Opinion") at 12-13 (discussing statistics related to voter registration in the

nineteen districts).[1] Thus, based solely on voter registration, there was no evidence of political gerrymandering. Yet, Petitioners did not contend that the evidence of gerrymandering could be found based upon the registration of the voters. Rather, they claimed that based upon the statistics of how voters actually cast their ballots in the past, the complexion of the districts was such that a Republican candidate would win in 13 or 14 of the 19 districts.

Judge Pellegrini agreed with Petitioners that roughly two-thirds of the districts would probably be won by Republicans, and that the legislature took the information it gleaned from analyzing voting trends and deliberately drew the congressional districts so as to grant an advantage to the Republican party. See Pellegrini Opinion at 16 and 27. Yet, Judge Pellegrini opined that Petitioners could not prevail on their gerrymandering claim, and were thus not entitled to relief, because Petitioners did not constitute an "identifiable political salient class". Pellegrini Opinion at 27.[2] The parties were then directed to file briefs with this court.

As we exercised plenary jurisdiction over this matter, but did not relinquish our jurisdiction when we ordered Judge Pellegrini to hold hearings and issue a report, our review of the Pellegrini Opinion is de novo. *Annenberg v.*

---

[1] The Pellegrini Opinion is attached at Appendix A.

[2] Petitioners also apparently pursued a state constitutional "one person, one vote" claim before Judge Pellegrini. *See* Pellegrini Opinion at 25. They also raised state constitutional law claims asserting an abridgement of their rights to free speech and free assembly. See Pa. Const. art. 1, §§ 7 and 20. Judge Pellegrini concluded that Petitioners were not entitled to relief on these claims. *See* Pellegrini Opinion at 25, 27-28. In their brief to this court, Petitioners fail to pursue these claims. Thus, they will not be considered by this court.

Commonwealth, 562 Pa. 581, 757 A.2d 338, 343 (Pa. 2000). Yet, we note that "when addressing the findings of fact made by [Judge Pellegrini], although such findings are not binding on us, we will afford them due consideration, as the jurist who presided over the hearings was in the best position to determine the facts." *Id.*

At the outset, we must address the claim raised by Lieutenant Governor/President Pro Tem of the Senate Jubelirer and Speaker Ryan (collectively, "the Presiding Officers") that Petitioners do not have standing to pursue this matter. The Presiding Officers raised this issue below via preliminary objections and Judge Pellegrini opted not to address it. Pellegrini Opinion at 20. They raise two major arguments in support of their position.

First, the Presiding Officers contend that Petitioners cannot attack the constitutionality of the reapportionment plan as a whole. Rather, the Presiding Officers claim that Petitioners have standing to attack the constitutionality of Act 1 only as it relates to their districts, and may not challenge Act 1 with regard to how it draws the lines for other districts in this Commonwealth. In support of this claim, they rely heavily on the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *United States v. Hays*, 515 U.S. 737, 132 L. Ed. 2d 635, 115 S. Ct. 2431 (1995).

Regardless of whether the Presiding Officers have correctly divined the holding of *Hays* as it relates to a determination of standing in matters commenced in federal court, it does not control our resolution of the standing issue. The U.S. Supreme Court has unequivocally declared that "state courts are not bound to adhere to federal standing requirements ...." *ASARCO Inc. v. Kadish*, 490 U.S. 605, 109 S. Ct. 2037, 2045, 104 L. Ed. 2d 696 (1989). The high Court recognized that in resolving issues of standing, state

courts are not constrained by the dictates of Article III of the United States Constitution. *Id.* Thus, *Hays* does not control the outcome of this issue.

This court has not squarely addressed whether a litigant challenging a plan reapportioning congressional districts may attack the entirety of the plan, or is relegated to complaining about merely the district in which he lives. This gap, however, may be filled by applying our general rule of standing to this matter. We have stated that a party has standing where that party is "aggrieved". *In re T.J.*, 559 Pa. 118, 739 A.2d 478, 481 (Pa. 1999). "For a party to be aggrieved, it must have: 1) a substantial interest in the subject matter of the litigation; 2) the party's interest must be direct; and, 3) the interest must be immediate and not a remote consequence of the action." *Id.* (citations and internal quotation marks omitted).

The Presiding Officers would have us declare that a litigant challenging a reapportionment plan can have a substantial, direct, and immediate interest in only that portion of the plan which drew the lines for his particular district. We believe such a narrow interpretation to be discordant with the reality of challenging a reapportionment scheme. In mounting such an attack, a litigant cannot logically confine his challenge to his particular district. A reapportionment plan acts as an interlocking jigsaw puzzle, each piece reliant upon its neighbors to establish a picture of the whole. An allegation that a litigant's district was improperly gerrymandered necessarily involves a critique of the plan beyond the borders of his district. Thus, we decline to find that a litigant challenging a reapportionment scheme must confine his attack to the drawing of the lines of his own district.

The Presiding Officers also make a brief argument that

political gerrymandering claims may be raised only by the Pennsylvania State Democratic Committee ("Democratic Committee") and not by individual voters.

The Presiding Officers have unwittingly presented an argument that is the mirror-opposite of what we have recently declared to be the law of standing in reapportionment matters. Shortly after the Presiding Officers filed their brief in this matter, we declared that "any entity not authorized by law to exercise the right to vote in this Commonwealth lacks standing to challenge the reapportionment plan." *Albert v. 2001 Legislative Reapportionment Comm'n,* 567 Pa. 670, 679, 790 A.2d 989, 995 (2002). This conclusion was compelled by the fact that it is "the right to vote and the right to have one's vote counted that is the subject matter of a reapportionment challenge . . . ." *Id.* Clearly, a political committee does not have the right, in and of itself, to vote. Thus, contrary to the Presiding Officers' contention, the Democratic Committee (or its leaders acting in their official capacities) are not the only entities that could have standing in this challenge; in fact, the Democratic Committee is specifically denied standing to assert such a challenge.[3] We therefore reject this argument.

---

[3] The Presiding Officers also briefly assert that Petitioners are unable to pursue this matter as they never adduced any evidence that Petitioners even exist, and thus Petitioners are no more than straw litigants. This argument must be rejected. The record reveals that Petitioners appended signed verifications that the averments contained in their Petition for Review are true and correct; these averments contain allegations that they are registered Democrats residing within Pennsylvania. Thus, we cannot accept the Presiding Officers' argument that Petitioners lack standing as there is no evidence that they exist.

Furthermore, to the extent that these verifications would be deemed insufficient to establish Petitioners' existence, a remand to Judge Pellegrini to hold a hearing on this limited issue would be a waste of judicial resources as we have determined that Petitioners are not entitled to relief on the substance of their state constitutional law claims.

The Presiding Officers assert that even if Petitioners are the proper parties to bring this challenge, we should still dismiss the matter without examining the merits. They contend that none of the protections afforded by the Pennsylvania Constitution may be extended to congressional elections; rather, they claim that the only applicable constitutional provisions are contained in the U.S. Constitution. In support of this contention, they note that the United States Constitution has given the state legislatures the power to draw congressional reapportionment plans. *See* U.S. Const. art. I, § 4, cl. 1. Thus, they conclude, as the legislature's power to effect a congressional reapportionment derives from the U.S. Constitution, then the Pennsylvania Constitution is inapplicable to a congressional reapportionment plan. They argue that we should thus deny Petitioners relief without examining the substance of the state constitutional law claims.

It is true that the U.S. Constitution has granted our legislature the power to craft congressional reapportionment plans. Yet, we see no indication that such a grant of power simultaneously suspended the constitution of our Commonwealth vis–a–vis congressional reapportionment. Without clear support for the radical conclusion that our Commonwealth's Constitution is nullified in challenges to congressional reapportionment plans, it would be highly inappropriate for us to so circumscribe the operation of the organic legal document of our Commonwealth. We therefore reject this argument.

The Presiding Officers also make a fleeting argument that the free and equal elections clause, Pa. Const. art. 1, § 5,

applies only in elections for offices of the Commonwealth. As the position of representative to the United States Congress is not an office of the Commonwealth, they reason, then this provision has no application to congressional elections. We reject this argument as nothing in the plain language of the free and equal elections clause limits it to elections for Commonwealth officials.

Having determined for the purposes of our review that Petitioners have standing and that the Pennsylvania Constitution applies to congressional reapportionment plans, we may now turn to the substance of Petitioners' challenge. The crux of this dispute is whether Petitioners have established that Act 1 constitutes unconstitutional political gerrymandering in violation of the equal protection guarantee, Pa. Const. art. 1, §§ 1 and 26, and the free and equal elections clause, Pa. Const. art. 1, § 5. As with any legislative enactment, Act 1 enjoys a presumption of constitutionality. *Commonwealth v. Means*, 773 A.2d 143, 147 (Pa. 2001). A plaintiff bears a heavy burden to prove it unconstitutional. "A statute will only be declared unconstitutional if it clearly, palpably and plainly violates the constitution." *Id.* (citations omitted).

This court did not always recognize that a claim of political gerrymandering was cognizable under the Pennsylvania Constitution. *See Newbold v. Osser*, 425 Pa. 478, 230 A.2d 54 (Pa. 1967). This court changed tack, however, in our unanimous decision *In re 1991 Reapportionment*, 530 Pa. 335, 609 A.2d 132 (Pa. 1992), and recognized that a litigant could raise claims that a reapportionment plan effected a political gerrymander and thus violated the U.S. and Pennsylvania Constitutions. This new view on the justiciability of political gerrymandering claims was predicated on the U.S. Supreme Court's decision

in *Davis v. Bandemer*, 478 U.S. 109 (1986), wherein the Court held that such claims were cognizable as a violation of the Equal Protection Clause.

Once having determined that the claim was justiciable, the next task for the *1991 Reapportionment* court was to define the contours of the test for determining whether unconstitutional political gerrymandering had occurred. Unfortunately, a majority of the *Bandemer* Court was unable to agree on the parameters of such a test. While the *Bandemer* Court issued no holding on this point, the 1991 Reapportionment court opted to follow the test set forth by the *Bandemer* plurality. The *1991 Reapportionment* court then proceeded to utilize the test set forth by the *Bandemer* plurality to resolve both federal and state constitutional political gerrymandering claims.

In resolving Petitioners' claim that Act 1 is a political gerrymander in violation of the Pennsylvania Constitution, we will continue the precedent enunciated in *1991 Reapportionment* and apply the test set forth by the *Bandemer* plurality. We reject Petitioners' arguments that we should declare that the right to vote guaranteed by our Commonwealth's Constitution provides broader protections than those guaranteed by the federal Equal Protection Clause. We come to this conclusion for two reasons. First, to the extent that Petitioners' gerrymandering claim is predicated on the equal protection guarantee contained in Pa. Const. art. 1, §§ 1 and 26, this court has previously determined that this right is coterminous with its federal counterpart. *Love v. Borough of Stroudsburg*, 528 Pa. 320, 597 A.2d 1137 (Pa. 1991). Second, we reject Petitioners' claim that the Pennsylvania Constitution's free and equal elections clause provides further protection to the right to vote than does the Equal Protection Clause. Petitioners

provide us with no persuasive argument as to why we should, at this juncture, interpret our constitution in such a fashion that the right to vote is more expansive than the guarantee found in the federal constitution. See generally *Commonwealth v. Edmunds*, 526 Pa. 374, 586 A.2d 887 (Pa. 1991).

While we continue to adhere to the view that the disposition of political gerrymandering claims should be controlled by the *Bandemer* plurality, we are also fully cognizant of the fact the plurality's opinion has bedeviled both commentators and courts, obscuring via its labrynthian twists and turns of logic the precise nature of the standard to be employed. *See, e.g.*, Michael E. Lewyn, *How to Limit Gerrymandering*, 45 Fl. Law Rev. 403, 443 (1993) (The *Bandemer* plurality has "confounded legislators, practitioners, and academics alike. Some find the case internally incoherent; others find a method to the madness." (internal quotation marks and citation omitted)). Yet, we find that by carefully parsing out the plurality's language, we can arrive at a simple (although decidedly not simplistic) recitation of the test. Distilled to its essence, the plurality's test states that a plaintiff raising a gerrymandering claim must establish that there was intentional discrimination against an identifiable political group and that there was an actual discriminatory effect on that group. *Bandemer*, 478 U.S. at 127. In establishing that there has been a discriminatory effect, the plaintiff must show two things: first, he must show that the identifiable group has been, or is projected to be, disadvantaged at the polls; second, he must establish that by being disadvantaged at the polls, the identifiable group will "lack ... political power and [be denied] fair representation." *Id.* at 139 (hereinafter referred to as the "effects test").

The first determination we must make is whether Petitioners have shown that the legislature in crafting Act 1 intentionally discriminated against an identifiable political group. The *Bandemer* plurality candidly recognized that in most instances, intentional discrimination would not be difficult to show since "[a]s long as redistricting is done by a legislature, it should not be very difficult to prove that the likely political consequences of the reapportionment were intended." *Bandemer*, 478 U.S. at 129. In the matter *sub judice*, Judge Pellegrini found that the legislature deliberately drew the congressional districts so as to grant an advantage to the Republican party and thus concluded that there was a discriminatory intent. *See* Pellegrini Opinion at 16 and 27. We see no basis to reject this conclusion.

Judge Pellegrini was not persuaded, however, that Petitioners had shown that citizens who vote Democratic (but are not necessarily registered Democrats) are an identifiable political group. He contended that Petitioners should be denied relief because they had failed to show that "[v]oters who are likely to vote Democratic (or Republican) in a particular district though not registered Democrats (or Republicans) based on the candidates or issues" are an identifiable political group. Pellegrini Opinion at 27.

We cannot agree with such a sweeping conclusion. While we are uncertain whether Petitioners' evidence established that there is an identifiable political class of citizens who vote for Democratic congressional candidates, we also find it to be imprudent to state, as a blanket proposition, that future plaintiffs could never adduce sufficient evidence to establish that such an identifiable class exists. We surmise that, particularly since the field of information technology is advancing at a breakneck speed, such a showing could be made by future challengers. However, it is not incumbent

upon us to resolve this thorny issue as Petitioners' claim falters on another basis. Thus, in this matter, we will assume without deciding that Petitioners have shown the existence of an identifiable political group.

The finding that there was an intent to discriminate and the assumption that Petitioners have shown the existence of an identifiable political class allows Petitioners to clear only the first hurdle of the test set forth by the *Bandemer* plurality. In order to show that there has been unconstitutional political gerrymandering, Petitioners must also show that the reapportionment plan works "an actual discriminatory effect ...." *Bandemer*, 478 U.S. at 127. As noted supra, the plaintiff must prove two things in order to establish an actual discriminatory effect. First, he must show that the reapportionment plan works disproportionate results at the polls; this can be accomplished via actual election results or by projected outcomes of future elections. *Id.* at 139. Second, he must adduce evidence indicating a "strong indicia of lack of political power and the denial of fair representation." *Id.* To meet this second prong of the effects test, the discriminated against group must show that it has "essentially been shut out of the political process." *Id. See also Pope v. Blue*, 809 F. Supp. 392 (W.D.N.C. 1992); *Badham v. Eu*, 694 F. Supp. 664 (N.D. Cal. 1988) (discussing the two prongs of the *Bandemer* plurality's actual discriminatory effects test).

We emphasize that the effects test is conjunctive in nature, and that both showings of an actual discriminatory effect must be made. The plurality explicitly stated that "a group's electoral power is not unconstitutionally diminished by the simple fact of an apportionment scheme that makes winning elections more difficult, and a failure of proportional representation alone does not constitute

impermissible discrimination under the Equal Protection Clause." *Bandemer*, 478 U.S. at 132 (citations omitted). The *Bandemer* plurality supported this conclusion by reasoning that "an individual or group of individuals who votes for a losing candidate is usually deemed to be adequately represented by the winning candidate and to have as much opportunity to influence that candidate as other voters in the district. We cannot presume in such a situation, without actual proof to the contrary, that the candidate elected will entirely ignore the interests of those voters." *Id.*

This is unquestionably an onerous standard, difficult for a plaintiff to meet. Yet it was not unwittingly crafted. The *Bandemer* plurality, aware that it was treading on ground that the judiciary had previously declared forbidden to itself, was chary about creating a test that would allow for officious interference with the state legislatures' prerogative to create reapportionment plans. While the *Bandemer* plurality gave notice to the state legislatures that they would no longer be free to construct political gerrymanders with impunity, it recognized that reapportionment is "the most political of legislative functions," one not amenable to judicial control or correction save for the most egregious abuses of that power. *Id.* at 143.[4]

---

[4] In this court's recent decision regarding challenges to reapportionment of the Pennsylvania Legislature, three Justices expressed receptiveness to the concern that the Court should not occupy an unduly passive role in the vindication of express state constitutional requirements of compactness and integrity of political subdivisions. *See Albert v. 2001 Legislative Reapportionment Comm'n*, 567 Pa. 670, 688, 790 A.2d 989, 1000 (2002) (Saylor, J., concurring). In the present context of Congressional reapportionment, however, there are no analogous, direct textual references to such neutral apportionment criteria. Accordingly, the significance of these factors to the present equal protection and free and equal election challenges is limited by the

In the matter *sub judice*, Petitioners adduced evidence showing that the number of congressional seats that Republicans are projected to win will be disproportionate to the percentage of the vote Republicans are anticipated to receive statewide. Even if we assume *arguendo* that this evidence establishes that Act 1 will effect disproportionate election results,[5] Petitioners are nonetheless not entitled to relief as they have not shown that there is a "strong indicia of lack of political power and the denial of fair representation." *See Bandemer,* 478 U.S. at 139. As stated *supra*, this prong of the effects test requires a plaintiff to establish that the discriminated against group has effectively been shut out of the political process. Petitioners have failed to meet this burden. First, they have not alleged in their brief to this court that a winning Republican congressional candidate "will entirely ignore the interests" of those citizens within his district who voted for the Democratic candidate. *See Bandemer*, 478 U.S. at 132. Also, it is undisputed that at least five of the districts are "safe seats" for Democratic candidates, thus further undermining Petitioners' claim that Democrats have been entirely shut out of the political process. *See Pope*, 809 F. Supp. at 397 (the party which was allegedly discriminated against had not been shut out of the political process where it was virtually guaranteed to win some seats.)

---

degree to which their presence or absence would evidence intent or effects under *Bandemer*.

[5] The Presiding Officers raise a host of issues challenging the admissibility of the evidence adduced by Petitioners at the hearing before Judge Pellegrini. We need not resolve these issues as we find that Petitioners' evidence, even assuming that it is all admissible, is insufficient to entitle them to relief.

Petitioners seem to believe that evidence of disproportionate results necessarily leads to a conclusion that there will also be a lack of political power and denial of fair representation, and that separate proof showing that the Democrats will be shut out of the political process is not necessary. In essence, Petitioners want us to collapse the two prongs of the effects test into one. This is precisely what the *Bandemer* plurality forbad, and we perceive no sound reason to ease Petitioners' burden in this respect.

Accordingly, we find that Petitioners have failed to carry their burden of establishing that Act 1 effectuates a political gerrymander in violation of the Pennsylvania Constitution, and thus deny relief on the state constitutional law claims raised in Petitioners' Petition for Review. As only the state law claims are before this court and those claims are dismissed, jurisdiction is relinquished.

Mr. Chief Justice Zappala files a dissenting opinion.

APPENDIX

RECOMMENDED FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

On January 10, 2002, JoAnn Erfer and Jeffrey Albert ("Petitioners") filed a Petition for Review in the Nature of a Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief ("Petition") in the Commonwealth Court of Pennsylvania challenging Act No. 2002-I ("Act 1"). This statute puts into place 19 congressional districts in accordance with the results of the 2000 Census. Named as Respondents were the Commonwealth; the Governor of Pennsylvania Mark Schweiker; Secretary of the Commonwealth, Kim Pizzingrilli; Commissioner of the Bureau of Commissions, Elections and Legislation of the Pennsylvania Department of State, Richard Filling (collectively, the "Commonwealth");

Lieutenant Governor Robert Jubelirer and Speaker of the House of Representatives Matthew Ryan ("Presiding Officers").

Petitioners allege that Act I violates certain constitutional rights under the United States Constitution. As to federal constitutional rights violated, it contends that Act 1 denies or abridges their "right to vote for their Representative to the United States Congress," in violation of U.S. CONST. art. I, § 2, and amendment XIV, § 2 and U.S. CONST. art. I, § 4 (Claim I); denies them "equal protection of the laws as guaranteed to them by the Equal Protection Clause" of amendment XIV, § 1 (Claim II); "constitutes an abridgment of the privileges and immunities of citizenship guaranteed to [them] by the Privilege or Immunities Clause" of amendment XIV, § 1 (Claim III); denies or abridges their "right to free association" as guaranteed to them by amendment I (Claim IV); and "constitute[s] a violation of" 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (Claim V).

Under the Pennsylvania Constitution, they contend that Act 1 denies or abridges their rights "as equally free and independent citizens" under PA. CONST. art. I, § 1 (Claim VI); denies or abridges their right "to a free and equal election" under PA. CONST. art. I, § 5 (Claim VII); discriminates against them in their "exercise of their civil rights" in violation of PA. CONST. art. I, § 26 (Claim VIII); and violates their rights "to assemble together for their common good" and their right to freedom of speech in violation of PA. CONST. art. 1, §§ 7 & 20 (Claim IX).

On January 11, 2002, Petitioners asked Commonwealth Court to expedite consideration of the case and on January 16, 2002, Presiding Officers filed preliminary objections to the Petition. Commonwealth Court ordered an expedited briefing schedule for the preliminary objections with

arguments to be held before Commonwealth Court *en banc* on March 13, 2002.

On January 25, 2002, Petitioners applied to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, asking it to assume plenary jurisdiction of the state constitutional claims (Claims VI-IX) under 42 Pa. C.S. § 726 and to expedite consideration. The Supreme Court responded with the following order:

> AND NOW, this 29th day of January, 2002, Petitioners' request that this court exercise plenary jurisdiction over this matter is GRANTED. The matter is REMANDED to the Commonwealth Court for expedited consideration. The Commonwealth Court is to limit its consideration of the matter to the state constitutional claim[s] raised by Petitioners in their Petition for Review that they filed with the Commonwealth Court on January 10, 2002 that is docketed at 10 M.D. 2002. The Commonwealth Court is directed to file its findings of fact and conclusions of law with this court no later than NOON on February 8, 2002.

Order dated 1/29/02 in Dkt. No. 14 MM 2002. By order the same day, a hearing was scheduled for Friday, February 1, 2002.

Also on January 29, 2002, Respondents filed an application to withdraw their preliminary objections, and simultaneously therewith, filed an Answer with New Matter to the Petition and a Third-Party Petition for Review in the Nature of a Complaint for Declaratory Relief, naming as third-party Respondents Richard & Norma Jean Veith and Susan Furey.

A hearing was held on February 1, 2002. Petitioners called six witnesses: Congressman Joseph Hoeffel, Professor David Lublin, Congressman Frank Mascara, Larry Sparr

(Director of Elections for Washington County), Representative William DeWeese (Minority Leader of the House), and Larry Ceisler (a paid partisan consultant & media political pundit).

The following exhibits of Petitioners were admitted over objection. The maps titled by Petitioners as "Conference Committee Plan" are the final maps enacted by Act 1.

Exhibit 1 Map: U.S. Congressional Districts 1992-2001.
Exhibit 2 Map: U.S. Congressional Districts 1992-2201 - Greater Southeast.
Exhibit 6 Map: 2001 Congressional Reapportionment Conference Committee Plan.
Exhibit 7 Map: 2001 Conference Committee Plan - Southeast Pa.
Exhibit 9 Map: 12th & 18th Congressional District - Conference Committee.
Exhibit 11 Map: 2001 Conference Committee Plan, Philadelphia County.
Exhibit 39 Chart: Percentage of the Republican Vote Needed for GOP to Win Seats Based on Statewide Election Results.
Exhibit 40 Graph: Percent of Votes to Elect 14 Republicans (1992) or 13 Republicans (Proposed Plan).
Exhibit 42 Chart: Compactness.
Exhibit 43 Graph: Percent Constituents Retained by Plan and Party.
Exhibit 44 Chart: Percentage of Districts with Above Average Republican Strength.
Exhibit 45 Graph: Average Share of Districts with Above Average GOP Statewide Vote Strength Based on Major-Party Vote.
Exhibit 47 Chart: Treatment of Incumbents: 1st Alternative Plan.

Exhibit 48 Chart: Treatment of Incumbents: Conference Plan.
Exhibit 49 Chart: Treatment of Incumbents: 2nd Alternative Plan.
Exhibit 50 Graph: Estimated Percent Republican Scats.
Exhibit 51 Chart: Partisan Characteristics of Districts: 1st Alternative Plan.
Exhibit 52 Chart: Partisan Characteristics of Districts: Conference Plan.
Exhibit 53 Chart: Partisan Characteristics of Districts: 1992 Plan.
Exhibit 54 Chart: Partisan Characteristics of Districts: 2nd Alternative Plan.
Exhibit 56 Untitled [Compilation of data].

The following stipulated exhibits were also admitted: Petitioners' Exhibit 37 (Resume of Dr. David Lublin) and Respondents' Exhibit 1 (Table: Voter Registration with New 2001 Congressional Districts). The following Petitioners' exhibits were admitted solely as "maps" (*see* Tr. at 204):

Exhibit 13 Map: 2001 Congressional Reapportionment 1st Alternative Plan.
Exhibit 17 Map: 2001 Congressional Reapportionment 2nd Alternative Plan.
Exhibit 55 Map: 2001 Congressional Reapportionment 3rd Alternative Plan.

Findings based on those maps were made together with Exhibit 56.

Because the Supreme Court had assumed plenary jurisdiction and could remand if it found the record was inadequate for it to make a decision, where challenges were made to evidence and where possible, discretion was exercised in favor of admitting evidence and testimony.

Judicial notice has also been taken of certain information that has been attached as an Appendix to Presiding Officers' brief and not introduced at trial.

On February 6, 2002, Petitioners filed an Application to Supplement the Record on the issue of standing which, on February 7, 2002, was denied.

Recommended Findings of Fact

1. Petitioners are JoAnn Erfer or Jeffrey B. Allen who are individuals with standing to maintain this action.

2. Respondents are the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Mark Schweiker, Governor of Pennsylvania; Kim Pizzingrilli, Secretary of the Commonwealth; Richard Filling, Commissioner of the Bureau of Commissions, Elections, and Legislation of the Pennsylvania Department of State; Robert C. Jubelirer, Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate of Pennsylvania; and Matthew J. Ryan, Speaker of the House of Representatives of Pennsylvania.

Background

3. When congressional seats were reapportioned after the 2000 Census, Pennsylvania lost two seats, dropping from 21 to 19. *See* Section 1 of Act I (noting that the Commonwealth was to be divided into 19 congressional districts); *Mellow v. Mitchell*, 530 Pa. 44, 607 A.2d 204 (1992) (Appendix A, dividing the Commonwealth into 21 districts); Tr. at 20 (Hoeffel) (noting that Act 1 "represents 19 seats down from our current 21").

4. Under the 1990 Census, Pennsylvania's total population was 11,881,643, making the "ideal" population for each of Pennsylvania's 21 congressional seats 565,792 or 565,793.

See Mellow v. Mitchell, 530 Pa. 44, 607 A.2d 204 (1992) (Appendix A).

5. Under the 2000 Census, Pennsylvania's total population was 12,281,054, making the "ideal" population for each of Pennsylvania's 19 congressional districts 646,371 or 646,372. *See* THE PENNSYLVANIA MANUAL, *Local Government* (115th edition.) (available on the Pennsylvania Department of State website at www.dgs.state.pa.us/PAManual/home.htm). (Appendix ("App.") Tab D contains copies of all data obtained from the Local Government section of the 115th edition of THE PENNSYLVANIA MANUAL).

6. The total population in Philadelphia decreased from 1,585,577 in 1990 to 1,517,550 in 2000. *See* THE PENNSYLVANIA MANUAL, *Local Government* (115th ed.) (App. Tab D).

7. The total population in Allegheny County decreased from 1,336,449 in 1990 to 1,281,666 in 2000, and the population of the City of Pittsburgh decreased from 369,879 in 1990 to 334,563 in 2000. *See* THE PENNSYLVANIA MANUAL, *Local Government* (115th ed. 2001) (App. Tab D); THE PENNSYLVANIA MANUAL *Local Government* (114th ed. 1999) (App. Tab F).

8. Between 1990 and 2000, significant population growth occurred in the counties surrounding Philadelphia (Chester, Montgomery, Delaware & Bucks), and the Pocono Region (Monroe, Pike & Wayne) as the following chart shows:

County	1990 Population	2000 Population
Bucks	541,174	597,635
Chester	376,396	433,501
Delaware	547,651	550,864
Monroe	95,709	138,687
Montgomery	678,111	750,097
Pike	27,966	46,302
Wayne	39,944	47,722

THE PENNSYLVANIA MANUAL, *Local Government* (115th ed.) (App. Tab D).

9. As of 2001, Pennsylvania has 67 counties and 2,569 cities, townships and boroughs. *See* THE PENNSYLVANIA MANUAL, Local Government (115th ed.) (App. Tab D).

10. Official voter registration data for November 2000 shows there were 7,781,997 registered voters in Pennsylvania: 3,250,764 (41.8%) Republicans; 3,736,304 (48.0%) Democrats; 7,918 (00.1%) Constitution; 30,248 (00.4%) Libertarian; 756,763 (09.7%) Other. *See* Certification No. 2002-11b, Office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth (App. Tab G).

11. Official voter registration data for November 2001 shows there were 7,773,403 registered voters in Pennsylvania: 3,233,171 (41.6%) Republicans; 3,733,766 (48.0%) Democrats; 3,268 (00.04%) Green; 803,198 (10.3%) Other. *See* Certification No. 2002-11b, Office of Secretary of the Commonwealth (App. Tab G).

12. Currently (elected in 2000 under the 1992 court-ordered congressional redistricting plan), there are 11 Republicans and 10 Democrats in Pennsylvania's congressional

delegation. *See* THE PENNSYLVANIA MANUAL, *Federal Government* (115th ed.) (App. Tab H).

13. Under the 1992 court-ordered congressional redistricting plan, Montgomery County was split among five congressional districts with the majority in the 13th district. *See Mellow v. Mitchell*, 530 Pa. 44, 607 A.2d 204 (1992) (Appendix A).

14. Under the 1992 court-ordered congressional redistricting plan (based on the legal description), 16 counties were split, 12 municipalities (cities, townships and boroughs) were split, 4 wards were split. Three of the above municipalities were split at the census block level. *See Mellow v. Mitchell*, 530 Pa. 44, 607 A.2d 204 (1992) (Appendix A).

15. Congressman William Coyne (Democrat) representing the 14th district located in Allegheny County, has announced he will not seek reelection. Tr. at 70 (Lublin) and App. Tab H.

16. There were two statewide elections in 1998 – U.S. Senator and Governor. In the election for U.S. Senator, of the 2,957,499 votes cast, the Republican candidate received 1,814,180 (61.3%), the Democrat candidate received 1,028,839 (34.8%), and the two other candidates received 114,480 (3.9%) of the votes. In the election for Governor, of the 3,024,941 votes cast, the Republican candidate received 1,736,844 (57.4%), the Democrat candidate received 938,745 (31.0%), and the other candidate received 349,352 (11.5%) of the votes. Certification No. 2002-10b, Office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth (App. Tab I).

17. In the only statewide race in 1999 (Superior Court

Judge), of the 4,023,279 total votes cast (two positions were open), the two Republican candidates received a total of 2,075,561 (51.6%) and the two Democrat candidates received a total of 1,947,718 (48.4%) (one Republican and one Democrat were elected). Certification No. 2002-10b, Office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth (App. Tab 1).

18. There were five statewide races in 2000 (President, U.S. Senator, Attorney General, Auditor General, State Treasurer). The following chart shows the results:

	Total Votes Cast	Republican Candidate
President	4,912,185	Election
U.S. Senator	4,735,116	2,481,962 (52.4%)
Attorney General	4,619,438	2,495,253 (54.0%)
Auditor General	4,664,541	1,862,934 (39.9%)
State Treasurer	4,680,934	2,307,422 (49.3%)

	Total Votes Cast	Democrat Candidate	Other Candidate
President	4,912,185	2,485,967 (50.6%)	145,091 (3.0%)
U.S. Senator	4,735,116	2,154,908 (45.5%)	98,246 (2.1%)
Attorney General	4,619,438	1,991,144 (43.1%)	133,041 (2.9%)
Auditor General	4,664,541	2,651,551 (56.9%)	150,056 (3.2%)
State Treasurer	4,680,934	2,211,471 (47.2%)	162,041 (3.5%)

Certification No. 2002-10b, Office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth (App. Tab I).

19. There were seven statewide races in 2001 (Supreme Court Justice, three Commonwealth Court Judges, three Superior Court Judges). The following chart shows the results (all seven Republican candidates won):

Election	Total Votes Cast	Republican Candidate(s)	Democrat Candidate(s)	Other Candidate
Supreme Court	2,005,422	1,051,360 (52.4%)	954,062 (47.6%)	0
Commonwealth Court	5,275,158	2,839,610 (53.8%)	2,435,548 (46.2%)	0
Superior Court	5,376,773	2,899,151 (53.9%)	2,477,622 (46.1%)	0

Certification No. 2002-l0b, Office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth (App. Tab I).

Enactment of Act No. 2002-I

20. Senate Bill 1200 was introduced on November 16, 2001. *See* Legislative History of SB 1200 (available, along with all versions of SB 1200 through the Electronic Bill Room on the General Assembly's website (www.legis.state.pa.us/WUOI LI/BI/billroom.htm)) (App. Tab A).

21. Congressman Joseph Hoeffel (D) testified before the Joint Hearing of the Senate and House State Government Committees on redistricting on November 27, 2001. Tr. at 29-30 (Hoeffel).

22. Congressman Frank Mascara (D) submitted written testimony to the Joint Hearing of the Senate and House State Government Committees on redistricting on November 28, 2001. Tr. at 116 (Mascara).

23. On December 10, 2001, the Senate passed SB 1200, PN 1531, which provided the legal descriptions for 19 congressional districts. Legislative History of SB 1200 (App. Tab A); SB 1200, PN 1531.

24. During debate in the Senate, a member of the Democrat Caucus offered A4552 as an amendment to SB 1200. *See* LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL-SENATE (Dec. 10, 2001) at 42-44 (App. Tab J). The amendment was defeated 27-22. *Id.*

25. The Senate declined to concur in the House amendment to SB 1200. *See* Legislative History of SB 1200 (App. Tab A).

26. The Senate and the House each appointed three members as conferees to a conference committee on SB 1200; the conferees for the House were Reps. Smith, Barley and Veon and the conferees for the Senate were Senators Brightbill, Piccola and Mellow. *See* Legislative History. Rep. DeWeese was not a conferee. Tr. at 149 (DeWeese).

27. On January 2, 2002, the Conference Committee reported a version agreed to by four of the six members (Reps. Smith and Barley and Senators Brightbill and Piccola). *See* SB 1200, PN 1645 (App. Tab B).

28. On January 3, 2002, the Senate, after debate, passed the Conference Committee Report on SB 1200 by a 28-22 vote. *See* Legislative History of SB 1200 (App. Tab A).

29. On January 3, 2002, the House, after debate, passed the Conference Committee Report on SB 1200 by a 139-52 vote, with 42 Democrats voting in favor of the bill. *See* Legislative History of SB 1200 (App. Tab A) and Tr. at 31-32, 107-08, 149-50.

30. Forty-two of the 98 members of the Democrat Caucus of the House of Representatives voted in favor of Act 1. Tr. at 149-150 (DeWeese). Without the vote of the 42 House Democrats, Act 1 would not have passed. *See* PA. CONST. art. II. § 10 (102 votes are needed for final passage); Proposed Finding of Fact 29 (final vote was 132-59).

After certification by the Presiding Officers of the Senate and House, SB 1200 was forwarded to Governor Schweiker, who, on January 7, 2002, signed SB 1200 into law as Act No. 2002-1 ("Act 1"). *See* Certified Copy of the Act 1 (App. Tab C); *see also* Legislative History of SB 1200 (App. Tab A).

The Effect of Act 1

30. Of the 19 districts put in place under Act 1, voter registration figures for the districts as of 2000 show that seven have a majority Republican registration and seven have a majority Democrat registration. Of the remaining five districts, three have a plurality Republican registration and two have a plurality Democrat registration. Respondents' Ex. I. The chart below shows the actual registration figures and percentages for each of the 19 districts:

Congressional District	Republican Registration	Democrat Registration	Other
1	83,648 (19.69%)	314,219 (73.96%)	26,967 (6.35%)
2	62,564 (13.65%)	360,599 (78.65%)	35,312 (7.70%)
3	171,435 (44.05%)	182,454 (46.89%)	35,263 (9.06%)
4	168,115 (38.55%)	225,631 (51.74%)	42,353 (9.71%)
5	190,842 (50.88%)	145,735 (38.86%)	38,481 (10.26%)
6	209,105 (49.87%)	150,634 (35.92%)	59,600 (14.21%)
7	279,835 (62.03%)	119,762 (26.55%)	51,547 (11.42%)
8	208,392 (48.75%)	160,289 (37.50%)	58,791 (13.75%)
9	190,087 (52.90%)	137,561 (38.28%)	31,714 (8.82%)
10	198,012 (52.06%)	147,823 (38.86%)	34,520 (9.08%)

Congressional District	Republican Registration	Democrat Registration	Other
11	135,536 (34.92%)	217,168 (55.96%)	35,389 (9.12%)
12	107,919 (27.30%)	259,845 (65.74%)	27,513 (6.96%)
13	209,502 (47.79%)	187,967 (42.88%)	40,882 (9.33%)
14	78,419 (17.31%)	335,317 (74.04%)	39,173 (8.65%)
15	164,599 (41.98%)	174,188 (44.43%)	53,273 (13.59%)
16	214,334 (57.52%)	106,083 (28.47%)	52,213 (14.01%)
17	203,089 (52.87%)	141,621 (36.86%)	39,443 (10.27%)
18	167,683 (37.05%)	242,385 (53.55%)	42,544 (9.40%)
19	207,675 (54.11%)	126,830 (33.04%)	49,318 (12.85%)

31. Under Act 1, Montgomery County is split among six congressional districts with the largest portion in the 13th district. *See* Section 1 of Act 1 (Legal Description). Under the court-ordered 1992 plan, Montgomery County was split among five congressional districts.

32. Under Act 1, there are five congressional districts in which it is safe to assume an incumbent Democrat congressman will win re-election (if the incumbent runs) in 2002. The five congressmen are Reps. Murtha, Kanjorski, Fatah, Brady and Doyle. Tr. at 22 (Hoeffel); Tr. at 165, 179, 189 (Ceisler).

33. Under Act 1, there is a district (District 6) in which no incumbent resides. Tr. at 33. 18 (Hoeffel).

34. Congresswoman Melissa Hart (District 4), a Republican, currently represents a district with a majority of registered Democrat voters, *see* Tr. 38 (Hoeffel). Under Act 1, District 4 continues to have a majority of registered Democrat voters (51.7% Democrat to 38.5% Republican). Respondents' Ex. 1.

Hearing Evidence

36. At the hearing, Petitioners presented evidence from six witnesses, including two sitting members of Congress, one member of the Pennsylvania General Assembly, and two expert witnesses. Respondents chose to present no witnesses, but did enter into the record evidence of voter registration totals in the districts created by Act 1.

37. Registered Democrat voters in Pennsylvania frequently "split" their votes among the candidates of various parties and "cross-over" to vote for Republican candidates. Tr. at 35 (Hoeffel); Tr. at 103 (Mascara); Tr. at 196 (Ceisler); *see* Proposed Findings of Fact 16-19.35.

38. The Pennsylvania Democrat party, according to Petitioners' witness, consists of "people who hold office in the Democratic party, people who aspire to hold office in the Democratic party, Democrats who have Democratic party ideals and vote Democratic." Tr. at 195 (Ceisler).

39. In Pennsylvania, only registered Democrat voters can sign nominating petitions and vote for those seeking to be nominated as the Democrat candidate for public office.

Section 802 of the Pennsylvania Election Code, Act of June 3, 1937, P.L. 1333, as *amended,* 25 P.S. § 2832.

40. Registered Republican voters in Pennsylvania frequently "split" their votes among the candidates of various parties and "cross-over" to vote for Democrat candidates. Tr. at 194 (Ceisler); *see* Proposed Findings of Fact 16-19.

41. Dr. David Lublin, an Assistant Professor of Government at American University and an expert in voting rights, redistricting and the statistical study of elections and redistricting plans, testified for Petitioners concerning the likely partisan effect of Act 1. Exh. 37; Tr. at 51:6-52:11 (Lublin).

42. In analyzing Act 1, Dr. Lublin used voting data from 19 prior statewide elections - including all of the federal statewide elections and all statewide executive office races from the 1990s - to analyze how the people in Act 1's districts would have voted under a variety of electoral conditions. Exhs. 39, 44, 56; Tr. at 54:13-55:11 (Lublin). Through this technique of "reaggregating" elections from the 1990s, Dr. Lublin was able to determine how particular districts in Act 1 lean (*i.e.,* Republican or Democratic) and whether particular incumbents are likely to be re-elected. Tr. 54:15-56:12 (Lublin).

43. To determine which way districts lean, Professor Lublin computed an average of votes on a district-by-district basis and then determined how many districts performed above or below that average for a party.

44. To determine whether a particular incumbent was likely to be re-elected, Dr. Lublin also looked at the districting plan

that was in effect throughout the 1990s. For those incumbents who have historically won in districts that lean against the incumbent's party, Dr. Lublin assumed they would continue to win if the district did not change very much. Tr. at 55:19-56:12 (Lublin).

45. Petitioners also presented the testimony of Mr. Larry Ceisler, a political consultant and expert in Pennsylvania politics. Mr. Ceisler used his experience and knowledge of Pennsylvania and past elections to explain the likely impact of Act 1 as well as the impetus behind its passage. Tr. at 157:15-160:22, 165:03-04, 165:19-167:22, 168:08-19, 170:24-171:23; 173:24-174:15, 175:17-176:10, 176:20-177:12, 192:07-11 (Ceisler).

The Effect of Act 1 on Party Membership on the Congressional Delegation

46. Act 1, the congressional redistricting plan passed by the General Assembly in January 2002 and signed into law by the Governor, creates only five or six districts that Democrats are likely to win out of 19, giving Republicans a 13-6 or 14-5 likely advantage in the Pennsylvania congressional delegation - even if they receive less than half the votes cast, in which case there is a reasonable likelihood that Democratic candidates will be able to prevail in 2002 and beyond.

47. Act 1 pairs two incumbent Democratic Congressmen into District 13, Congressmen Hoeffel and Borski. Exh. 7; Tr. at 18:14-18:16 (Hoeffel). Congressman Hoeffel testified that it is highly probable that Congressman Borski would defeat him in the Democratic primary but he would lose the general election to a moderate Republican from the Montgomery

County portion of District 13. About 53 percent of the 13th District's population live in Montgomery County and about 47 percent live in Philadelphia. Tr. at 19:7-19:19 (Hoeffel). Indeed, Melissa Brown, a Republican from Montgomery County, has already announced her intention to run. Tr. at 19:20-20:13 (Hoeffel). Brown, who is pro-choice, would likely defeat the pro-life Congressman Borski. Tr. at 166:07-167:22 (Ceisler).

48. Under Act 1, Congressman Holden, a Democrat, who is paired in the 17th District with Congressman Gekas, a Republican, is likely to be defeated in a seat that strongly favors the Republican. Exh. 6; Tr. at 21:15-21:18 (Hoeffel). Act 1 also pairs Democratic Congressmen Doyle and Coyne; Coyne has indicated he will retire.

49. Congressman Mascara is not paired with an incumbent, but Act 1 places him in a radically reconfigured district which heavily favors a specific Republican challenger - State Senator Tim Murphy. Tr. at 97:24-99:09, 109:15-23 (Mascara).

50. Act 1 congressional districts have wide disparities in the proportion of constituents that Democratic and Republican incumbents retain from their old districts.

51. The congressional districts drawn by Act 1 was for the purpose and intent to elect more Republican members to Congress than Democrats. See, e.g., Exhs. 6, 39, 40, 48, 50; Tr. at 53:10-15, 64:14-68:10 (Lublin); 165:03-04 (Ceisler).

District Lines

52. Under Act 1, lines were drawn using census tracts rather than precincts, i.e., voting or election districts. Act 1 splits six election precincts or voting districts into multiple congressional districts, doubling the number of precinct splits in the 1992 plan. Act 1; Exh. 56 at 25, 28.

53. Act 1's District 6 is an irregular, "dragon-shaped" district that covers three counties in southeast Pennsylvania and includes several wholly distinct, unconnected communities of interest. Exh. 7; Tr. at 16:9-16:24 (Hoeffel). District 6 is centered in rural Chester County, extends deeply into Berks County, and then comes into Montgomery County at Limerick Township just below Pottstown, includes the borough of Pottstown itself, swings to the east and then down towards the south through the center of Montgomery County to pick up the county seat of Norristown and Lower Merion Township. Exh. 7; Tr. at 16:9-16:24 (Hoeffel). In so doing, District 6 combines the relatively unrelated rural parts of Chester and Berks County with the "densely settled suburban" communities of Norristown, Plymouth, Lower Merion and Narberth in Montgomery County. Exh. 7; Tr. at 16:18-16:24 (Hoeffel).

54. Act I divides up western Pennsylvania as can best be seen by the jagged and irregular line between Districts 12 and 18.

55. Act 1's districts are significantly less compact than under prior plans in Pennsylvania. Professor Lublin analyzed compactness using two separate measures - "Perimeter Measure" and "Dispersion Measure" - that are generally accepted in Professor Lublin's field and widely used in

redistricting cases. Exh. 42; Tr. at 78:12-78:15 (Lublin). Using Professor Lublin's "Perimeter Measure Analysis," four of Act 1's districts - Districts 1, 6, 12 and 18, are less compact than the least compact district under the 1992 plan. Exh. 42. On average, Act 1's districts are less compact than those in prior decades. Exh, 42; Tr. at 80:1-5 (Lublin).

56. Act 1 divides 65 municipalities in comparison with only 13 municipal splits in the 1992-2001 map, a fivefold increase. Tr. at 177:04-12 (Ceisler). Petitioners' Alternate Plans 1 and 2 split only 18 municipalities. Tr. at 177:04-19 (Ceisler). District 12 by itself splits more than 20 townships. Exh. 6. Act 1 also splits *25* counties into multiple districts, up from 18 county splits under the 1992 plan. Exh. 6; Exh. 56, at 25-27.

Alternate Plans

57. Petitioners submitted into evidence three alternative redistricting plans to highlight the bias in Act 1. Exhs. 13, 17, 55. Exhibits 13, 17 and 55 are labeled alternative plans 1, 2 and 3, respectively.

58. None the alternative plans were before the General Assembly. Tr. at 80 (Petitioners' counsel). *See* Exhibits 13, 17 and 55. Petitioners' Exhibit 56 is composed of all the data on which Dr. Lublin relied, including data on compactness, population deviation, electoral results, etc. Exh. 56, Tr. at 80:9-13 (Lublin). All data used by Dr. Lublin was derived from the General Assembly through the House Minority Demographics office. Tr. at 55:8-55:11 (Lublin). All conclusions are based on the accuracy of Exh. 56, at 19. 21. 22.

59. Alternate Plans 1 and 2 split no precincts. Exh. 56, at 21-24, 29-32. Splitting election precincts will cause problems "for ballot tabulation, counting and casting." Tr. at 125:5-127:12, 128:14-128:18 (Spahr).

60. Both Alternate Plans 1 and 2 would likely result in a 10-9 Republican advantage in Pennsylvania's congressional delegation. Exhs. 47, 49, 50; Tr. at 53:15-19, 73:21-74:8 (Lublin); Tr. at 177:20-25 (Ceisler). Alternates 1 and 2 would pair one set of Democrats and one set of Republicans. Tr. at 179:10-16 (Ceisler). Each eliminates one incumbent Democrat and one incumbent Republican. Exh. 13; 22:22-23:17 (Hoeffel).

61. Alternate Plans 1 and 2 also have more compact districts on average than Act 1. Exh. 42; Tr. at 80:1-5 (Lublin). Alternate Plans 1 and 2 split fewer counties and municipalities than Act 1. Plaintiffs' 1st Alternate Plan splits 24 counties, 18 municipalities, 0 precincts. Exh. 56, at 29-30. Plaintiffs' 2nd Alternate Plan splits 23 counties, 18 municipalities. 0 precincts. Exh. 56, at 31-32.

62. Plaintiffs' 1st Alternate Plan has a maximum population deviation of 19 people (646,361 people in District 7, 646,380 people in District 8). Exh. 56, at 21. Plaintiffs' 2nd Alternate Plan has a maximum population deviation of 15 people (646,365 people in District 14, 646,380 people in Districts 16 and 19). Exh. 56, at 23.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Because the Commonwealth has withdrawn its preliminary objections, it has waived the issue of Petitioners' standing. Pa. R. C. P. No. 1019; *In Re: Estate of Alexander*, 758 A.2d 182 (Pa. Superior Ct. 2000). Presiding Officers still

have outstanding preliminary objections, including one addressing standing, and until those preliminary objections are heard, Petitioners are presumed to have standing for the purpose of this proceeding.

2. Petitioners bear the burden of proving that Act 1 is unconstitutional. *Singer v. Sheppard*, 464 Pa. 387, 346 A.2d 897 (1975); *In re Ross Township Election District Reapportionment*, 489 A.2d 297 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1985). There is a presumption in favor of constitutionality and "all doubt is to be resolved in favor of sustaining the legislation." *Id.* (quoting *Milk Control Commission v. Battista*, 413 Pa. 652, 659, 198 A.2d 840, 843 (1964)). "An Act of Assembly will not be declared unconstitutional unless it *clearly, palpably and plainly* violates the Constitution." *Singer*, 464 Pa. at 393, 346 A.2d at 900 (quoting *Daly v. Hemphill*, 411 Pa. 263, 271, 191 A.2d 835, 840 (1963)) (emphasis added). The standard is no different when the challenge is to a redistricting plan. *In re Ross Township Election District Reapportionment*, 489 A.2d 297 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1985), *affd.*, 514 Pa. 41, 522 A.2d 553 (1987).

3. Article I, Section 4, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution provides that, "The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof: ....."

4. Article 2, § 16 of the Pennsylvania Constitution provides for the reapportionment of the General Assembly. It states that:

> The Commonwealth shall be divided into fifty senatorial and two hundred three representative districts, which shall be composed of compact and contiguous territory as nearly equal in population as practicable. Each senatorial district shall elect one Senator, and each representative

district one Representative. Unless absolutely necessary no county, city, incorporated town, borough, township or ward shall be divided in forming either a senatorial or representative district.

5. Article 2, § 11 of the Pennsylvania Constitution requires and provides for the reapportionment of local municipalities, providing:

> Within the year following that in which the Federal decennial census is officially reported as required by Federal law, and at such other times as the governing body of any municipality shall deem necessary, each municipality having a governing body not entirely elected at large shall be reapportioned, by its governing body or as shall otherwise be provided by uniform law, into districts which shall be composed of compact and contiguous territory as nearly equal in population as practicable, for the purpose of describing the districts for those not elected at large.

6. While 19 states have adopted state constitutional provisions regulating Congressional reapportionment, at least one of which mandated districts that were "contiguous and compact," *see Brown v. Saunders*, 159 Va. 28, 166 S.E. 195 (Va. 1932) (discussion of Section 55 of the Virginia Constitution), there is no Pennsylvania constitutional provision specifically dealing with Congressional reapportionment.

7. Although the General Assembly derives its authority over congressional redistricting from the U.S. Constitution, and there is no express state constitutional provision regulating congressional reapportionment, it does not follow that any other applicable provisions of the Pennsylvania Constitution would not be controlling on the Pennsylvania General

Assembly. The General Assembly is created by the Pennsylvania Constitution and is bound by its provisions. To find otherwise would mean that the 19 State Constitutions that have specific constitutional provisions would not be binding on their legislatures.

8. Article 1, § 5 of the Pennsylvania Constitution provides that:

> Elections shall be free and equal; and no power, civil or military, shall at any time interfere to prevent the free exercise of the right of suffrage.

9. In the context of a challenge to reapportionment by the General Assembly, Article 1, § 5 of the Pennsylvania Constitution, has been interpreted as follows:

> Elections are free and equal within the meaning of the Constitution when they are public and open to all qualified electors alike; when every voter has the same right as any other voter; when each voter under the law has the right to cast his ballot and have it honestly counted; when the regulation of the right to exercise the franchise does not deny the franchise itself, ... and when no constitutional right of the qualified elector is subverted or denied him.

In re 1991 Pennsylvania Legislative Reapportionment Commission, 530 Pa. 335, 356, 609 A.2d 132, 142 (1992), quoting from *City Council of City of Bethlehem v. Marcincin*, 512 Pa. 1, 8, 515 A.2d 1320, 1232 (1986) (quoting *Shankey v. Staisey*, 436 Pa. 65, 69, 257 A.2d 897, 898 (1969), *cert. denied*, 396 U.S. 1038, 24 L. Ed. 2d 682, 90 S. Ct. 684 (1970)).

10. In *In re 1991 Pennsylvania Legislative Reapportionment Commission*, our Supreme Court addressed a claim of

political gerrymandering, a claim of deprivation of free and equal elections, and a violation of equal protection under the state constitutional provisions at issue here and the [14]th Amendment to the United States Constitution. Without making a separate analysis for each issue, it found determinative of all the state and federal constitutional claims the three-prong test set forth by the Supreme Court of the United States in *Davis v. Bandemer*, 478 U.S. 109 (1986). That analysis requires that the plaintiff establish:

> 1. intentional discrimination against an identifiable political group;
>
> 2. an actual discriminating effect on that group; and
>
> 3. a history of disproportionate results appear[ing] in conjunction with strong indicia of lack of political power and the denial of fair representation.

In adopting the *Bandemer* analysis, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court went on to state that, "this Court is persuaded by the holding of the Supreme Court of the United States with regard to the elements of a prima facie case of political gerrymandering." *In re 1991 Pennsylvania Legislative Reapportionment Commission*, 530 Pa. at 355, 609 A.2d at 142.

11. No Pennsylvania cases have addressed whether Article 1, § 5 of the Pennsylvania Constitution applies to congressional redistricting processes. It appears that in order to make out a violation of Article 1, § 5 within the context of congressional redistricting, the same elements that must be shown for a violation under the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment and Article I, §§ 1 & 26 of the Pennsylvania

Constitution must be met. *In re 1991 Pennsylvania Legislative Reapportionment Commission.*

12. Article 1, § 26 of the Pennsylvania Constitution provides:

> Neither the Commonwealth nor any political subdivision thereof shall deny to any person the enjoyment of any civil right, nor discriminate against any person in the exercise of any civil right.

13. Article 1, § 1 of the Pennsylvania Constitution provides that:

> All men are born equally free and independent, and have certain inherent and indefeasible rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing and protecting property and reputation, and of pursuing their own happiness.

14. Article I, §§ 1 & 26, together, constitute an equal protection guarantee. *See Love v. Borough of Stroudsburg*, 528 Pa. 320, 597 A.2d 1137 (1991). The guarantee promises protection at least as strong as the Equal Protection Clause of the United States Constitution's Fourteenth Amendment. If Act 1 violates the Fourteenth Amendment's Equal Protection Clause, it *a fortiori* violates Pennsylvania's equal protection guarantee.

15. Partisan gerrymandering cases in congressional redistricting are justiciable under the Pennsylvania Constitution. *In re 1991 Pennsylvania Legislative Reapportionment Comm'n.*

16. Petitioners contend that their rights under Article 1, § 5 to a free and equal election and Article I, §§ 1 & 26 to equal protection guaranteed by the Pennsylvania Constitution have been violated because:

- There is no justification for the nineteen vote disparity between Congressional districts. Act 1 violates the constitutional requirement of "one-person-one vote."

- Pennsylvania elections should be structured in such a way that when parties demonstrate equal levels of public support, Congressional Districts must be reapportioned in such a way so as to demonstrate a rough correlation between that support and the number of seats that each party receives. Because Act I allows Republican congressional candidates to gather fewer than half of the votes but more than twice - and perhaps nearly three times - as many seats as Democrats, petitioners argue that Act 1 is outside any margin of error that the Free and Equal Elections clause can be interpreted to permit.

17. The nineteen vote disparity does not violate the one-person-one vote requirement because the deviation is *de minimus*. In *In re Pennsylvania Legislative Reapportionment Commission*, 609 A.2d at 147 (Pa. 1992), our Supreme Court noted that it has approved legislative reapportionment total percentage deviations from ideal district population of:

	Senate	House
1991	1.87%	4.94%
1981	1.93%	2.81%
1971	4.31%	5.45%

18. Even assuming that justification for such a *de minimus* difference was needed, the splitting of municipal boundaries would not be a factor in showing a lack of justification because, unlike for legislative reapportionment, there is no requirement that municipal boundaries be taken into

consideration in a Congressional Reapportionment. Moreover, Petitioners failed to meet its burden that the deviation is not justified and that some deviation is unavoidable, no matter what the plan, because census districts, let alone voting districts, are not equal in population.

19. No court has addressed what should be considered an identifiable political group but "as a threshold matter, plaintiffs must show that they are members of an identifiable political group whose voting strength has been diluted. They must first prove that they belong to a politically salient class...", *Karcher v. Daggett*, 462 U.S. 725, 754 (1983) (Stevens, J., concurring), and identify with at least some degree of specificity, what group has been denied an effective vote. *See Shaw v. Reno*, 509 U.S. 630 (1993).

20. Because out of the 19 districts created under Act 1, seven have a majority Republican registration and seven have a majority Democrat registration, and of the remaining five districts, three have a plurality Republican registration and two have a plurality Democrat registration, Petitioners make no claim that voters registered as Democrats have been discriminated against. But they do claim that because of ticket splitting, census tracts, in which voters that are registered in one party often ticket split to vote another way or on an issue, have been amalgamated in such a way to give Republicans the advantage.

21. Voters who are likely to vote Democratic (or Republican) in a particular district though not registered Democrats (or Republicans) based on the candidates or issues are not an identifiable political salient class necessary to establish a violation under Article I, § 5 and Article I, §§ 1 & 26 of the Pennsylvania Constitution. *See* Conclusion of Law 10 & 19.

22. While the congressional districts were drawn to give Republican candidates and Republican incumbents an advantage through a sophisticated analysis of voting trends, matching of issues, matching of potential candidates and residency of candidates, none of that conduct discriminates against any identifiable political group. Because they have not shown that the rights of any identifiable political group have been violated, Petitioners have failed to set forth a cause of action that Article I, § 5 and Article I, §§ 1 & 26 of the Pennsylvania Constitution have been violated.

23. Art. 1, § 7 of the Pennsylvania Constitution provides:

> The printing press shall be free to every person who may undertake to examine the proceedings of the Legislature or any branch of government, and no law shall ever be made to restrain the right thereof The free communication of thoughts and opinions is one of the invaluable rights of man, and every citizen may freely speak, write and print on any subject, being responsible for the abuse of that liberty. No conviction, shall be had in any prosecution for the publication of papers relating to the official conduct of officers or men in public capacity, or to any other matter proper for public investigation or information, where the fact that such publication was not maliciously or negligently made shall be established to the satisfaction of the jury; and in all indictments for libels the jury shall have the right to determine the law and the facts, under the direction of the court, as in other cases.

24. Petitioners have failed to propose any findings or conclusion regarding and, in any event, the Petition fails to state a claim for which relief can be granted on this claim.

25. Article I, § 20 of the Pennsylvania Constitution provides

that:

> The citizens have a right in a peaceable manner to assemble together for their common good, and to apply to those invested with the powers of government for redress of grievances or other proper purposes, by petition, address or remonstrance.

26. Petitioners have failed to propose any findings or conclusion regarding Article I, § 20, and, in any event, the Petition fails to state a claim for which relief can be granted on this claim.

27. Because Petitioners have failed to make out a claim that any provision of the Pennsylvania Constitution has been violated, their Petition should be dismissed.

Respectfully submitted,

DAN PELLEGRINI, JUDGE

COMMONWEALTH COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

ORDER

AND NOW, this 8th day of February, 2002, it is hereby Ordered that the attached Amended Recommendation Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law be filed in the above-captioned case.

AMENDED RECOMMENDED FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Paragraph 5 of the Recommended Conclusions of Law is amended to read:

5. Article 9, § 11 of the Pennsylvania Constitution requires and provides for the reapportionment of local municipalities, providing:

> Within the year following that in which the Federal decennial census is officially reported as required by Federal law, and at such other times as the governing body of any municipality shall deem necessary, each municipality having a governing body not entirely elected at large shall be reapportioned, by its governing body or as shall otherwise be provided by uniform law, into districts which shall be composed of compact and contiguous territory as nearly equal in population as practicable, for the purpose of describing the districts for those not elected at large.

Respectfully submitted,

DAN PELLEGRINI, JUDGE

Commonwealth Court of Pennsylvania

AMENDED RECOMMENDED FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Paragraph 46 of the Recommended Findings of Fact is amended to read:

46. Act 1, the congressional redistricting plan passed by the General Assembly in January 2002 and signed into law by the Governor, creates only five or six districts that Democrats are likely to win out of 19, giving Republicans a

13-6 or 14-5 likely advantage in the Pennsylvania congressional delegation - even if they receive less than half the votes cast, in which case there is a reasonable likelihood that Republican candidates will be able to prevail in 2002 and beyond.

Respectfully submitted,

DAN PELLEGRINI, JUDGE

Commonwealth Court of Pennsylvania

MR. CHIEF JUSTICE ZAPPALA

I find that the General Assembly's plan violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution and would remand with directions to the General Assembly to reapportion the federal congressional districts. The evidence presented before the Commonwealth Court establishes that the current reapportionment plan was formulated so as to intentionally discriminate and dilute the vote of an identifiable political group and had an actual discriminatory effect on that group.[1]

Although I agree with the majority's resolution of the standing issue, I feel compelled to address the overzealous nature of the arguments made in this regard. The unusual argument has been made that Petitioners lacked standing to

---

[1] This case is distinguishable from *Albert v. 2001 Legislative Reapportionment Comm'n*, 567 Pa. 670, 790 A.2d 989 because there the challengers failed to establish the elements of political gerrymandering. The challengers in *Albert* primarily focused upon the compactness and contiguousness of their individual districts. Their claims did not object to the plan as a whole. Here, Petitioners offered sufficient evidence of the unconstitutional statewide impact of the congressional redistricting plan.

bring this challenge to the congressional reapportionment plan because they failed to demonstrate that they have never voted for a political candidate who was not a Democrat. It is asserted that Petitioners did not establish standing to complain on behalf of the Democratic Party for that reason.

It would come as a great surprise to registered Republicans or Democrats who have cast votes in elections for candidates who were not members of the same party that they are not "true" Republicans or Democrats, but instead some unidentifiable political group. It is suggested that a voter in this Commonwealth must always choose the candidate offered by his or her own party in order to be a "true" Republican or Democrat. No voter can fail to represent his or her party by selecting the candidate believed to be the best-suited to represent the citizens of this Commonwealth.

In the final analysis, it is the individual who possesses integrity, sound judgment and the ability to lead, rather than follow, who will truly serve his or her constituents. These qualities are not within the exclusive domain of any political party. When voting patterns are used then as the foundation to ensure the continued success of one particular party, as here, the principles of the U.S. Constitution are defeated and we are all ill-served.

The assertion that Petitioners lack standing to enforce those constitutional principles has no support in our jurisprudence. It is claimed that Petitioners failed to establish that they have standing to pursue a political gerrymandering claim because they have failed to show individualized harm and have alleged and presented only harm to a group. It is argued that the group's interest in litigation challenging a statewide plan as a partisan gerrymander could be asserted by the Pennsylvania Democrat State Committee or its

leaders.

As noted by the majority, this Court examined the principle of standing in the context of a challenge to the reapportionment of state legislative districts in *Albert*. We held that "any entity not authorized by law to exercise the right to vote in this Commonwealth lacked standing to challenge the reapportionment plan." *Id.* at 995. This holding did not represent a new principle of law; instead it followed the well-established test for standing articulated by this Court in *William Penn Parking Garage, Inc. v. Pittsburgh*, 464 Pa. 168, 346 A.2d 269 (Pa. 1975) and the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in 1964 in *Reynolds v. Sims*, 377 U.S. 533 (1964).

We stated in *Albert* that

> it is the right to vote and the right to have one's vote counted that is the subject matter of a reapportionment challenge. Significantly, as noted by the United States Supreme Court in *Reynolds v. Sims*, "the right to vote is personal" and "the rights sought to be vindicated in a suit challenging an apportionment scheme are 'personal and individual'" 377 U.S. at 554-555 (citing *United States v. Bathgate*, 246 U.S. 220, 227, 62 L. Ed. 676, 38 S. Ct. 269 (1916)); *South v. Peters*, 339 U.S. 276, 280, 70 S. Ct. 641, 94 L. Ed. 834 (1950).

Id. at 994-95.

Following the narrow framework of their view of standing, Respondents have developed their argument that Petitioners have failed to demonstrate a violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Although this analysis would deny a registered voter the opportunity to raise a constitutional challenge on behalf of

his or her political party, and limit this right to some nebulous prototype voter, this Court has not done so. Instead, we have recognized that protection is afforded to the voter, rather than to a party.

In *Davis v. Bandemer*, 478 U.S. 109 (1986) (plurality opinion), the United States Supreme Court addressed an equal protection challenge to Indiana's 1981 legislative reapportionment of the state's legislative districts pursuant to the 1980 census. The appellees, several Indiana Democrats, challenged the reapportionment plan, alleging that the plan constituted a political gerrymander intended to disadvantage Democrats. A three-judge panel of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana was convened to hear the claims. Elections were held under the new districting plan before the case was heard. Two years later, the divided district court issued a decision declaring the reapportionment to be unconstitutional and ordered the legislature to prepare a new plan. The United States Supreme Court reversed. A majority of the Court concluded that political gerrymandering was a justiciable question, but concluded that the district court had applied the incorrect standard in finding unconstitutional vote dilution.

The context in which the equal protection challenge arose is relevant to our discussion. Indiana's legislature consisted of 100 members of the House of Representatives and 50 members of the Senate. The reapportionment plans created 50 single member districts for the Senate; in the House of Representatives, it provided for 7 triple-member, 9 double- member, and 61 single-member districts. County and city lines were not consistently followed, although township lines generally were. Each Senate district was not divided exactly into two House districts and there was little relation between the lines drawn in the Senate and House plans.

When the elections were first held under the new districting plans, all of the House seats and half of the Senate seats were up for election. As described by the Supreme Court, Democratic candidates received 51.9% of the vote over all the House races statewide, but only 43 Democrats were elected to the House. In two counties, which had been divided into multi- member House districts, Democratic candidates obtained 46.6% of the vote, but secured only 3 of 21 House seats. In the races for 25 senatorial seats, Democratic candidates received 53.1% of the statewide vote, resulting in the election of 13 Democrats.

The district court found support for the challengers' position in the election results and concluded that further examination of the circumstances surrounding the reapportionment was warranted. The court noted the irregular shape of district lines, the fact that multi-member districts were suspect in terms of compactness, and that district lines failed to adhere consistently to boundaries of political subdivisions.[2] The court found that explanations offered for the configuration of the districts to be inadequate.

These factors led the district court to conclude that the reapportionment plan had been drawn intentionally to favor Republican incumbents and candidates and to disadvantage Democratic voters. The court found this was achieved by "stacking" Democrats into districts with large Democratic majorities and "splitting" them in other districts so as to give Republicans safe, although not excessive, majorities in those districts. The U.S. Supreme Court described these tactics as

---

[2] The district court's analysis of these factors is reflective of the type of analysis undertaken by this Court in addressing challenges to the state reapportionment plan in *Albert*, *supra*.

> familiar techniques of political gerrymandering. Democratic (or Republican, as the case may be) votes are "stacked" and "wasted" by creating districts where Democrats form majorities much greater than the 50% necessary to carry those districts. Concurrently, Republican votes are spread among districts in which they form safe, perhaps 55% majorities, and Democratic votes are "cracked" or "split" by dispersing them in such a way as to be ineffectual.

478 U.S. at 117, n.6. The district court invalidated the reapportionment plan, finding that the plan had a discriminatory effect in that the proportionate voting influence of Democratic voters had been adversely affected.

Part II of the U.S. Supreme Court's opinion, which was authored by Justice White and joined by five other Justices, addressed the question of whether the case presented a justiciable controversy or a nonjusticiable political question. In addressing that issue, Justice White observed that

> Since *Baker v. Carr*, 369 U.S. 186, 7 L. Ed. 2d 663, 82 S. Ct. 691 (1962), we have consistently adjudicated equal protection claims in the legislative districting context regarding inequalities in population between districts. In the course of these cases, we have developed and enforced the "one person, one vote" principle. *See, e.g. Reynolds v. Sims*, 377 U.S. 533, 12 L. Ed. 2d 506, 84 S. Ct. 1362 (1964).

478 U.S. at 118.

Justice White further explained that "in formulating the one person, one vote formula, the Court characterized the question posed by election districts of disparate size as an issue of fair representation."

> In such cases, it is not that anyone is deprived of a vote or that any person's vote is not counted. Rather, it is that one electoral district elects a single representative and another district of the same size elects two or more – the elector's vote in the former district having less weight in the sense that he may vote for and his district be represented by only one legislator, while his neighbor in the adjoining district votes for and is represented by two or more.

Id. at 123. "Since the achieving of fair and effective representation for all citizens is concededly the basic aim of legislative apportionment, we conclude that the Equal Protection Clause guarantees the opportunity for equal participation by all voters in the election of State legislators." *Id.* at 123-24 (citation omitted).

He noted that challenges premised upon political gerrymandering differ from those based upon claims that districts of disparate size violated the equal protection clause, stating that

> not only does everyone have the right to vote and to have his vote counted, but each elector may vote for and be represented by the same number of lawmakers. Rather, the claim is that each political group in a State should have the same chance to elect representatives of its choice as any other political group. Nevertheless, the issue is one of representation, and we decline to hold that such claims are never justiciable.

Id. at 124 (emphasis added).

The Court concluded that the fact that the claim was brought by a political group, rather than a racial group or a group claiming that a reapportionment plan diluted the

weight of votes because of place of residence, simply did not justify a refusal to entertain such a claim. "That the characteristics of the complaining group are not immutable or that the group has not been subject to the same historical stigma may be relevant to the manner in which the case is adjudicated." *Id.* at 125.

Having determined that the appellees had presented a justiciable claim, the Court then discussed whether the district court had erred in holding that the appellees had alleged and proved a violation of the equal protection clause. Part III of Justice White's opinion, however, garnered only three other votes.[3] The Court was unable to reach a consensus on the issue of what a claimant must prove in order to establish vote dilution in this context. Discussion of the plurality's analysis is necessary, however, to illustrate the Court's perceived failings in the appellees' presentation of their equal protection claim.

The Court agreed with the district court that in order to succeed the appellees were required to prove both intentional discrimination against an identifiable political group and an actual discriminatory effect on that group. The Court declined to overturn the district court's finding of discriminatory intent as clearly erroneous, finding that the record presented would support a finding that the discrimination was intentional. Acknowledging the political realities of districting and apportionment, and that "the political profile of a State, its party registration, and voting records are available precinct by precinct, ward by ward", the Court observed that "as long as redistricting is done by a

[3] Justices Brennan, Marshall and Blackmun joined Part III of Justice White's opinion.

legislature, it should not be very difficult to prove that the likely political consequences of the reapportionment were intended." *Id.* at 129 (footnote omitted).[4]

The Court found, however, that appellees had failed to establish a sufficiently adverse effect on their constitutionally protected rights under the equal protection clause. The district court had identified the political group suffering discrimination as those voters who voted for Democratic Assembly candidates in Indiana's 1981 election and relied primarily on the results of that single election to meet the requirements of a political gerrymandering claim.[5] The Court concluded that relying upon a single election to prove unconstitutional discrimination was unsatisfactory. The Court stated,

> The District Court did not find that because of the 1981 Act the Democrats could not in one of the next few elections secure a sufficient vote to take control of the assembly. Indeed, the District Court declined to hold that the 1982 election results were the predictable consequences of the 1981 Act and expressly refused to hold that those results were a reliable prediction of future ones. The District Court did not ask by what percentage the statewide Democratic vote would have had to increase to control either the House or the Senate. The

[4] The court cautioned, however, that the fact that intentional discrimination may not be difficult to demonstrate did not relieve a challenger of the burden of proof.

[5] As noted above, in that election Republican candidates received 48.1% of the votes cast statewide for the House of Representatives, but won 57 of the 100 seats to be filled. As for the Senate, Republican candidates received 46.9% of the votes cast statewide, but won 12 of the 25 seats to be filled.

> appellants argue here, without a persuasive response from the appellees, that had the Democratic candidates received an additional few percentage points of the votes cast statewide, they would have obtained a majority of the seats in both houses. Nor was there any finding that the 1981 reapportionment would consign the Democrats to a minority status in the Assembly throughout the 1980's or that the Democrats would have no hope of doing any better in the reapportionment that would occur after the 1990 census. Without findings of this nature, the District Court erred in concluding that the 1981 Act violated the Equal Protection Clause.

Id. at 135-36 (emphasis added).

The Court determined that the appellees had failed to demonstrate that there had been an unconstitutional discrimination against members of the Democratic party by premising their claim solely upon the results of a single election. "[A] mere lack of proportionate results in one election cannot suffice in this regard." *Id.* at 139. Equal protection violations will be found only where a history (actual or projected) of disproportionate results appears in conjunction with strong indicia of lack of political power and the denial of fair representation. *Id.* at 139-40.

The Court was not indifferent, however, to the fact that discriminatory effects need not be suffered first before an equal protection claim could be brought. "*Projected* election results based on district boundaries and past voting patterns may certainly support this type of claim even where *no* election has yet been held under the challenged districting." *Id.* at 40 n.17.

The case before us stands in stark contrast to *Bandemer*. Petitioners here have amply demonstrated that the

reapportionment plan improperly diluted the votes of Democrats in violation of the equal protection clause. As required by the *Bandemer* court, Petitioners have established that the reapportionment plan was intentionally drawn so as to deprive the influence of Democratic voters on the political process as a whole. They have demonstrated also that the plan effectively secures an advantage to Republican candidates of 13-6 or 14-5 in the Pennsylvania congressional delegation. The continual succession of Republican candidates is also achieved by the reasonable likelihood that they will prevail in 2002 and beyond.

Undisputedly, an equal protection challenge will not be sustained merely because particular candidates may not win in any given election. The U.S. Constitution was not designed to promote particular campaigns. What is at stake, and what is entitled to protection, is more sacred. It is the fundamental principle that we are governed by democracy and not oligarchy.

When that fundamental principle is disregarded, as in this case, we have lost more than the representation of a Republican or Democratic elected official in the United States Congress.

Here, Respondents have focused on whether individual voters may be adequately represented by any winning candidate. They have ignored, however, the more significant inquiry posed by the U.S. Supreme Court. The issue is not whether any elected official has the ability to represent his or her constituent. No election, and no constitution, can guarantee any voter capable representation.

The issue is whether the reapportionment plan has denied voters of a fair chance to influence the political process. This inquiry focuses not on the effects of a single election, but on

the election process itself. It is when this inquiry is undertaken that the constitutional flaws of this reapportionment plan are revealed.

The following findings of fact made by Judge Dante Pellegrini of the Commonwealth Court demonstrate a violation of the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment:

Hearing Evidence

36. At the hearing, Petitioners presented evidence from six witnesses, including two sitting members of Congress, one member of the Pennsylvania General Assembly, and two expert witnesses. Respondents chose to present no witnesses, but did enter into the record evidence of voter registration totals in the districts created by Act 1.

37. Registered Democrat voters in Pennsylvania frequently "split" their votes among the candidates of various parties and "cross-over" to vote for Republican candidates. Tr. at 35 (Hoeffel); Tr. at 103 (Mascara); Tr. at 196 (Ceisler); *see* Proposed Findings of Fact 16-19.35.

38. The Pennsylvania Democrat party, according to Petitioners' witnesses, consists of "people who hold office in the Democratic party, people who aspire to hold office in the Democratic party, Democrats who have Democratic party ideals and vote Democratic." Tr. at 195 (Ceisler).

39. In Pennsylvania, only registered Democrat voters can sign nominating petitions and vote for those seeking to be nominated as the Democrat candidate for public office. Section 802 of the Pennsylvania Election Code, Act of June 3, 1937, P.L. 1333, *as amended*, 25 P.S. § 2832.

40. Registered Republican voters in Pennsylvania frequently "split" their votes among the candidates of various parties and "cross-over" to vote for Democrat candidates. Tr. at 194 (Ceisler); *see* Proposed Findings of Fact 16-19.

41. Dr. David Lublin, an Assistant Professor of Government at American University and an expert in voting rights, redistricting and the statistical study of elections and redistricting plans, testified for Petitioners concerning the likely partisan effect of Act 1. Exh. 37; Tr. at 51:6-52:11 (Lublin).

42. In analyzing Act 1, Dr. Lublin used voting data from 19 prior statewide elections - including all of the federal statewide elections and all statewide executive office races from 1990s - to analyze how the people in Act 1's districts would have voted under a variety of electoral conditions. Exhs. 39, 44, 56; Tr. at 54:13-55:11 (Lublin). Through this technique of "reaggregating" elections from the 1990s, Dr. Lublin was able to determine how particular districts in Act 1 lean (*i.e.*, Republican or Democratic) and whether particular incumbents are likely to be re-elected. Tr. 54:15-56:12 (Lublin).

43. To determine which way districts lean, Professor Lublin computed an average of votes on a district-by-district basis and then determined how many districts performed above or below that average for a party.

44. To determine whether a particular incumbent was likely to be re- elected, Dr. Lublin also looked at the districting plan that was in effect throughout the 1990s. For those incumbents who have historically won in districts that lean against the incumbent's party, Dr. Lublin assumed they would continue to win if the district did not change very much. Tr. at 55:19- 56:12 (Lublin).

45. Petitioners also presented the testimony of Mr. Larry Ceisler, a political consultant and expert in Pennsylvania politics. Mr. Ceisler used his experience and knowledge of Pennsylvania and past elections to explain the likely impact of Act 1 as well as the impetus behind its passage. Tr. at 157:15-160:22, 165-03-04, 165:19-167:22, 168:08-19, 170:24-171:23; 173:24-174:15, 175:17-176:10, 176:20-177:12, 192:07-11 (Ceisler).

The Effect of Act 1 on Party Membership on the Congressional Delegation

46. Act 1, the congressional redistricting plan passed by the General Assembly in January 2002 and signed into law by the Governor, creates only five or six districts that Democrats are likely to win out of 19, giving Republicans a 13-6 or 14-5 likely advantage in the Pennsylvania congressional delegation - even if they receive less than half the votes cast, in which case there is a reasonable likelihood that Republican candidates will be able to prevail in 2002 and beyond.[6]

47. Act 1 pairs two incumbent Democratic Congressmen into District 13, Congressmen Hoeffel and Borski. Exh. 7; Tr. at 18:14-18:16 (Hoeffel). Congressman Hoeffel testified that it is highly probable that Congressman Borski would defeat him in the Democratic primary but he would lose the general election to a moderate Republican from the Montgomery County portion of District 13. About 53 percent of the 13th District's population live in Montgomery County and about 47

[6] Paragraph 46 reflects the amended finding of fact submitted by Judge Pellegrini. The amendment deleted a typographical error in the original submission of his findings of fact.

percent live in Philadelphia. Tr. at 19:7-19:19 (Hoeffel). Indeed, Melissa Brown, a Republican from Montgomery County, has already announced her intention to run. Tr. at 19:20-20:13 (Hoeffel). Brown, who is pro-choice, would likely defeat the pro-life Congressman Borski. Tr. at 166:07-167:22 (Ceisler).

48. Under Act 1, Congressman Holden, a Democrat, who is paired in the 17th District with Congressman Gekas, a Republican, is likely to be defeated in a seat that strongly favors the Republican. Exh. 6; Tr. at 21:15-21:18 (Hoeffel). Act 1 also pairs Democratic Congressmen Doyle and Coyne; Coyne has indicated he will retire.

49. Congressman Mascara is not paired with an incumbent, but Act 1 places him in a radically reconfigured district which heavily favors a specific Republican challenger - State Senator Tim Murphy. Tr. at 97:24-99:09, 109:15-23 (Mascara).

50. Act 1 congressional districts have wide disparities in the proportion of constituents that Democratic and Republican incumbents retain from their old districts.

51. The congressional districts drawn by Act 1 was for the purpose and intent to elect more Republican members to Congress than Democrats. See, e.g., Exhs. 6, 39, 40, 48, 50; Tr. at 53:10-15, 64:14-68:10 (Lublin); 165:03-04 (Ceisler).

District Lines

52. Under Act 1, lines were drawn using census tracts rather than precincts, i.e., voting or election districts. Act 1 splits six election precincts or voting districts into multiple congressional districts, doubling the number of precinct splits in the 1992 plan. Act 1; Exh. 56 at 25, 28.

53. Act 1's District 6 is an irregular, "dragon-shaped" district that covers three counties in southeast Pennsylvania and includes several wholly distinct, unconnected communities of interest. Exh. 7; Tr. at 16:9-16:24 (Hoeffel). District 6 is centered in rural Chester County, extends deeply into Berks County, and then comes into Montgomery County at Limerick Township just below Pottstown, includes the borough of Pottstown itself, swings to the east and then down towards the south through the center of Montgomery County to pick up the county seat of Norristown and Lower Merion Township. Exh. 7; Tr. at 16:9-16:24 (Hoeffel). In so doing, District 6 combines the relatively unrelated rural parts of Chester and Berks County with the "densely settled suburban" communities of Norristown, Plymouth, Lower Merion and Narberth in Montgomery County. Exh. 7; Tr. at 16:18- 16:24 (Hoeffel).

54. Act 1 divides up western Pennsylvania as can best be seen by the jagged and irregular line between Districts 12 and 18.

55. Act 1's districts are significantly less compact than under prior plans in Pennsylvania. Professor Lublin analyzed compactness using two separate measures - "Perimeter Measure" and "Dispersion Measure" - that are generally accepted in Professor Lublin's field and widely used in redistricting cases. Exh. 42; Tr. at 78:12-78:15 (Lublin). Using Professor Lublin's "Perimeter Measure Analysis," four of Act 1's districts - Districts 1, 6, 12 and 18, are less compact than the least compact district under the 1992 plan. Exh. 42. On average, Act 1's districts are less compact than those in prior decades. Exh. 42; Tr. at 80:1-5 (Lublin).

56. Act 1 divides 65 municipalities in comparison with

only 13 municipal splits in the 1992-2001 map, a fivefold increase. Tr. at 177:04-12 (Ceisler). Petitioners' Alternate Plans 1 and 2 split only 18 municipalities. Tr. at 177:04-19 (Ceisler). District 12 by itself splits more than 20 townships. Exh. 6. Act 1 also splits 25 counties into multiple districts, up from 18 county splits under the 1992 plan. Exh. 6; Exh. 56, at 25-27.

As the U.S. Supreme Court observed, "the question is whether a particular group has been unconstitutionally denied its chance to effectively influence the political process." *Bandemer*, 478 U.S. at 132-33. The record reveals that the answer is yes. If the record of this case does not establish unconstitutional political gerrymandering, no such claim exists. This Court should not then waste its valuable judicial resources entertaining illusory claims that, in reality, can never be established.

Thus, I dissent.

Appendix E

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

RICHARD VIETH, NORMA JEAN VIETH, and SUSAN FUREY,	)
Plaintiffs,	)
v.	) No. 1: CV 01-2439
	) Judge Rambo,
THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA; MARK S. SCHWEIKER, et al	) Judge Yohn, Judge) Nygaard
Defendants.	)

NOTICE OF APPEAL OF PLAINTIFFS RICHARD VIETH, NORMA JEAN VIETH, and SUSAN FUREY

Plaintiffs Richard Vieth, Norma Jean Vieth, and Susan Furey hereby appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the Order and Judgment entered in this manner on January 24, 2003. The appeal is taken pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1253.

Respectfully submitted,

REED SMITH LLP

By /s/ Robert B. Hoffman

Robert B. Hoffman
I.D. No. 23846
P.O. Box 11844
Harrisburg, PA 17108
(717) 257-3042

Paul M. Smith
Thomas J. Perrelli
Bruce V. Spiva
Daniel Mach
JENNER & BLOCK, L.L.C.
601 Thirteenth Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 639-6000

Attorneys for Plaintiffs
Richard Vieth, Norma Jean
Vieth, and Susan Furey

Dated: February 24, 2003

Appendix F

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

RICHARD VIETH, NORMA JEAN VIETH, and SUSAN FUREY,
Plaintiffs,
v.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA; MARK S. SCHWEIKER, in his official capacity as Governor of Pennsylvania; KIM PIZZINGRILLI, in her official capacity as Secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; RICHARD FILLING, in his official capacity as Commissioner of the Bureau of Commissions, Elections, and Legislation of the Pennsylvania Department of State; ROBERT C. JUBELIRER, in his official capacity as Lieutenant Governor of Pennsylvania and President of the Pennsylvania Senate; MATTHEW J. RYAN, in his official capacity as Speaker of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives,
Defendants.

NO. 3:CV-01-2439

AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

1. The plaintiffs have brought this action to enforce voting rights guaranteed to them by the United States Constitution. As registered Democrats and voters in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the plaintiffs have exercised, and wish to continue exercising, their right to vote

for their preferred candidates for United States Representative, both in general elections and in Democratic Party primary elections. The congressional districting plan that the Pennsylvania General Assembly imposed on the Commonwealth on January 3, 2002, however, violates plaintiffs' rights under the United States Constitution.

PARTIES

2. Plaintiff Richard Vieth is a registered Democrat and under the new districting plans resides in District 16. He resides at 632 Laurel Lane, Lancaster, Pennsylvania 17601.

3. Plaintiff Norma Jean Vieth is a registered Democrat and under the new districting plans resides in District 16. She resides at 632 Laurel Lane, Lancaster, Pennsylvania 17601.

4. Plaintiff Susan Furey is a registered Democrat and a resident of Montgomery County. She resides at 507 Bryn Mawr Avenue, Bala Cynwyd, Pennsylvania, 19004. Under the districting plan established in 1992, Furey resided in District 13. Under the new districting plan, Furey resides in District 6, which is overpopulated and non-compact.

5. Defendants are the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and officials thereof who have duties and responsibilities under the laws of the Commonwealth to redraw congressional districts in Pennsylvania following the release of population data from each federal decennial census and then to conduct elections in those districts. Defendant Mark S. Schweiker is the Governor of Pennsylvania. Defendant Kim Pizzingrilli is the Secretary of the Commonwealth and oversees Pennsylvania's electoral process. Defendant Richard Filling is the Commissioner of

the Bureau of Commissions, Elections, and Legislation of the Pennsylvania Department of State, which is charged with administering functions related to Pennsylvania's electoral process. Defendant Robert C. Jubelirer is the Lieutenant Governor of Pennsylvania and President of the Pennsylvania Senate. Defendant Matthew J. Ryan is the Speaker of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

6. This Court has exclusive jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343(a)(3), 1343(a)(4), 1357, 2201, 2202, and 2284. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).

RELEVANT STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

7. Section 2 of Article I of the United States Constitution, as amended by Section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment, provides, in part, that "[t]he House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States" and that "Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State . . . ."

8. Section 4 of Article I of the United States Constitution grants limited authority to the Legislature of each State to determine "[t]he Times, Places and Manner of holding elections for . . . Representatives." As the Supreme Court of the United States has recognized, State Legislatures are more limited in their authority to draw congressional

districts than they are under their inherent power to draw their own state legislative districts.

9. In the First Amendment to the Bill of Rights, the United States Constitution protects the rights of freedom of speech and association.

10. The Equal Protection Clause of Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment prohibits any State from "deny[ing] to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

11. The Privileges and Immunities Clause of Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment prohibits any State from "abridg[ing] the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States."

12. Together these constitutional provisions embody fundamental guarantees that every citizen, regardless of race or political party, will have a fair and equal opportunity to cast a meaningful ballot for members of Congress and a fair and meaningful opportunity to be represented by a person of their choice in the United States Congress. These guarantees include, among other things, the one-person, one-vote principle – requiring each of a State's congressional districts to contain the same number of persons, absent a legitimate justification – and the prohibition against invidious partisan gerrymanders, which operate to consistently degrade the votes of a particular disfavored group.

THE 1992 CONGRESSIONAL PLAN AND THE 2000 CENSUS

13. In March 1992, the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania ordered into effect a congressional districting

plan establishing Pennsylvania's 21 current congressional districts. Although that plan did not achieve perfect population equality among the districts, the Supreme Court ruled that slight deviations in population can be justified when the deviations are necessary to protect other important districting interests such as the preservation of local municipal boundaries. The plan that the Supreme Court ordered into effect split 27 localities (including 19 counties and 8 cities, towns, and boroughs) and 3 election precincts; the Supreme Court rejected a competing plan that had a smaller population deviation on the grounds that it split 48 localities (including 21 counties and 27 cities, towns, and boroughs) and 22 election precincts. *See Mellow v. Mitchell*, 607 A.2d 204 (Pa. 1992). The Pennsylvania Supreme Court also found that the plan they adopted was fair to both major political parties.

14. After the Supreme Court ordered the 1992 plan into effect, a three-judge federal court reviewed its validity. The three-judge court ruled that the Pennsylvania Supreme Court's plan was valid, and in interpreting *Mellow v. Mitchell*, 607 A.2d 204 (Pa. 1992), recognized that, "the Pennsylvania Supreme Court identified in its opinion the avoidance of municipal splits as an important public policy of the Commonwealth." The Court wrote, "This conclusion is a matter of Pennsylvania state law and we are bound by it." *Nerch v. Mitchell*, No. 92-0095, slip op. at 32 - 33 (M.D. Pa. Aug. 13, 1992) (per curiam).

15. Under the 1992 Plan, which was used for the most recent congressional elections in November 2000, citizens of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania cast almost an identical number of votes for Democratic candidates as

for Republican candidates, and elected 11 Republicans and 10 Democrats to Congress.

16. The 2000 election was the last under the 1992 plan drawn by the Pennsylvania Supreme Court. On December 28, 2000, the Secretary of Commerce reported to the President of the United States the tabulation of population for each of the fifty States, including the defendant Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, as determined in the 2000 decennial census. Those population figures showed that Pennsylvania is now entitled to only 19 Representatives in Congress – a decrease of two Representatives since the 1990 census. The census data also show that Pennsylvania's resident population as of April 1, 2000, was 12,281,054 persons – 646,371 or 646,372 persons for each of the 19 congressional districts.

17. During its regular session in 2001, the General Assembly was unable to reach agreement on a congressional redistricting plan. The State House of Representatives passed one plan and the State Senate passed a different plan. The General Assembly adjourned on December 13, 2001, at an impasse.

18. Before and after the deadlock, national Republican leaders sought to use the Pennsylvania congressional redistricting process, which was wholly controlled by the Republican General Assembly and Republican governor, to achieve national political ends, rather than to reach a result in the interests of the people in Pennsylvania. National Republican leaders pressured Pennsylvania legislators to push for maximum partisan advantage, regardless of the cost. Karl Rove, a political advisor to President George W. Bush – who lost in

Pennsylvania – asked state Republicans to favor the plan passed by the state Senate rather than the more moderate House plan. Rep. Thomas M. Davis III, a Republican of Virginia and the chairperson of the National Republican Congressional Committee, stated publicly that Pennsylvania would serve as a payback for whatever redistricting successes Democrats might have had elsewhere. "Democrats rewrote the book when they did Georgia, and we would be stupid not to reciprocate," he said. Pennsylvania "will make Georgia look like a picnic." Press accounts report that Pennsylvania House Majority Leader John Perzel also received phone calls from Republican Sen. Rick Santorum and House Speaker Dennis Hastert regarding the importance of maximizing the number of seats that would elect Republicans and thus rigging the districts against the Democratic party and the interests of Democratic voters.

THE NEW CONGRESSIONAL PLAN

19. Following the end of the General Assembly's regular session, Republicans from the House and Senate worked to reach agreement on a plan that would satisfy the interests of their Republican colleagues and the national Republican party. At all points, Democratic state legislators, including those on the Conference Committee, were shut out of this process. Democratic leaders in the House and Senate were presented, for the first time, with a final version of a proposed congressional redistricting plan on the morning of the conference committee on January 2, 2002. The Democratic members of the Conference Committee had no input whatsoever on the final plan. The Conference Committee voted this plan out on straight party lines.

20. On January 3, 2002, the General Assembly passed the new congressional redistricting plan, Senate Bill 1200 (SB1200). That plan, delineating 19 congressional districts to comport with reapportionment following the 2000 Census, not only fails to equalize the population of each congressional district, but also ignores all traditional redistricting criteria, including the preservation of local government boundaries, solely for the sake of partisan advantage.

21. Under SB 1200, the Commonwealth's most populated district, District 7, would have a population of 646,380. The Commonwealth's least populated districts, Districts 1, 2, and 17, would each have populations of 646,361. This creates a total population deviation of 19, which is lower than the total population deviation in the 1992 plan, but in contrast to the 1992 plan, the new plan's deviation serves no recognizable legitimate interest: rather than protecting municipal boundaries, the plan splits units of local governments throughout the state among multiple districts. SB 1200 splits 84 local governments, including 25 counties and 59 cities, boroughs, or townships, as well as 41 wards. (To avoid double counting, Philadelphia for these purposes has been treated as a county, not as both a county and a city.) Montgomery County alone is split into six different congressional districts. This is in sharp contrast with the plan drawn by the Pennsylvania Supreme Court in 1992, which recognized the importance of preserving local government boundaries and split only 19 counties and 8 cities, townships, and boroughs.

22. SB 1200 also ignores all other traditional redistricting criteria, thus demonstrating that partisanship – and nothing else – was the rationale behind the plan. Rather

than protecting communities of interest, it fractures them, substituting meandering and irregular lines through the state. District 6, for example, looms like a dragon descending on Philadelphia from the west, splitting up towns and communities throughout Montgomery and Berks Counties. District 7 is barely contiguous. District 8 includes an ungainly gash that at one point narrows to 300 yards and extends five and a half miles into Montgomery County, nearly splitting neighboring District 13 in two. District 12 snakes through several counties, leaving no fewer than 25 split cities, towns, and boroughs. Not surprisingly, the districts in SB 1200 are far less compact than those in the 1992 plan.

23. In constructing SB1200, the General Assembly did not attempt to preserve the cores of existing districts (which minimizes voter confusion by displacing fewer voters from their current districts), protect incumbents, establish partisan balance, or advance any of the legitimate redistricting criteria recognized by the United States Supreme Court or by scholars in the field of redistricting. Rather, the General Assembly's purpose and intent in enacting SB 1200 was to maximize the representation of Republican interests and minimize the representation of Democrats, no matter what the cost. Indeed, rather than preserving the seniority and power of the Pennsylvania congressional delegation, thereby enhancing Pennsylvania's clout in Washington, the General Assembly sought to replace Democratic members who have seniority with first-term Republicans. As Republicans in the General Assembly have explained, rigging the electoral system in favor of Republicans will advance the policy agenda of current President Bush, which they believe should be in the interests

of all residents of the Commonwealth – regardless of the fact that a majority of citizens voted against President Bush.

PARTISAN IMPACT OF SB 1200

24. The partisan effects of SB 1200 are massive. As Democratic state legislators have explained, SB 1200 is a "massacre." SB 1200 ensures that the voting preferences of the residents of Pennsylvania will *not* be reflected in congressional elections and consistently degrades the votes of Democratic voters in the Commonwealth.

25. In terms of voter preferences, the two major political parties hold nearly equal support among Pennsylvania residents, with a slight preference for Democrats. Registered Democrats outnumber registered Republicans 3,733,739 to 3,233,171, a division between the two major parties of 53.6% to 46.4%.

26. Further, on neutral playing fields free from partisan gerrymandering, Democrats consistently perform competitively in Pennsylvania elections. In twenty-one congressional races during the 2000 elections, the aggregate vote for Democrats was 2,279,227, or 50.6%, while the aggregate vote for Republicans was 2,229,057, or 49.4% of the major parties' vote totals.

27. Democrats also received more total votes than Republicans in the five statewide races in 2000, as Democrats received 11,495,041 votes to Republicans' 11,428,698, a margin of 50.1% to 49.9%. (The vote totals in those elections include the race for President, with Democrat Al Gore receiving 2,485,967 votes (50.6% of all votes cast) to Republican George Bush's 2,281,127 votes (46.4%); the

race for Attorney General, in which incumbent Republican Mike Fisher received 2,495,253 votes (55.6% of votes for major party candidates) and Democrat Jim Eisenhower received 1,991,144 votes (44.4%); the race for Auditor General, in which incumbent Democrat Bob Casey, Jr. received 2,651,551 votes (58.7% of votes for major party candidates) and Republican Katie True received 1,862,934 votes (41.3%); the race for State Treasurer, in which the incumbent Republican Barbara Hafer received 2,307,422 votes (51.1% of votes for major party candidates) to Democrat Catherine Knoll Baker's 2,211,471 votes (48.9%); and the race for United States Senator, in which incumbent Republican Rick Santorum received 2,481,962 votes (53.5% of votes for major party candidates) to Democrat Ron Klink's 2,154,908 votes (46.5%).)

28. The new plan will have serious consequences on the Pennsylvania congressional delegation's ability to represent the preferences of Pennsylvania voters. Despite the Commonwealth's 50/50 split between Democrats and Republicans – or, more accurately, its slight preference for Democrats – the new plan will likely result in a congressional delegation consisting of 13 Republicans and 6 Democrats. Some Republicans have boasted that their majority will be even greater, producing a 14-to-5 edge. Thus, even if they continue, as they have, to receive more than 50% of the vote in congressional elections, Democratic candidates will win less than 1/3 of the seats in Congress; Republicans, receiving less than half of the total votes cast, will receive twice (and almost three times) as many congressional seats.

HARM CAUSED BY SB 1200

29. SB 1200 harms the people of Pennsylvania, particularly Democratic voters, such as plaintiffs, and the Democratic Party, in several distinct ways. First, SB 1200 dilutes the votes of people living in districts that are overpopulated, i.e., contain more than 646,371 people. Those districts include Districts 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, and 19. It does so without any legitimate justification.

30. SB 1200 is also an egregious partisan gerrymander. A partisan gerrymander refers to a district-based election system that rigs a political system in favor of one party. Indeed, Congress has outlawed the use of multi-member districts in drawing congressional districts, 2 U.S.C. § 2(c), precisely because such districts allow a majority party in the state legislature to rig the congressional elections in their favor. A partisan gerrymander does precisely the same thing.

31. By "packing" voters of one party in some districts and "cracking" or fragmenting them in others, a partisan gerrymander ensures that one party wins more representation than its voting strength would otherwise allow. It thus dilutes the voting strength of voters of the other party. The effect of a partisan gerrymander is often referred to as bias – the lines are drawn in such a way as to favor (to be biased toward) one party, which is able to win more representation with fewer votes.

32. SB 1200 is a massive political gerrymander. It packs and fragments Democratic voters to ensure that their votes are worth less than Republican votes. Thus, although Pennsylvania is a 50/50 state, SB 1200 was designed to

ensure that Republicans would win at least 13 of the 19 congressional seats. In terms of bias, SB 1200 gives Republicans a bias of over 18% – for less than 50% of the votes, they receive at least 68% of the seats in Congress. The plan does not merely fail to apportion seats proportionally; it maximizes the Republicans' partisan advantage to the exclusion of all other criteria. In terms of magnitude, SB 1200 is one of the most egregious partisan gerrymanders in recent history. It is significantly worse than that challenged in *Davis v. Bandemer*, 478 U.S. 109 (1986), in which the Supreme Court recognized the justiciability of partisan gerrymandering. It gives one party a two- or three-to-one advantage based on nothing other than the packing and cracking of voters.

33. This bias will not apply in simply one political election, but will affect every future election under SB 1200, regardless of the political conditions. It cements Republican power and effectively reduces Democrats to being a small minority of the Commonwealth's congressional delegation for the coming election and likely the coming decade.

34. By diluting the voting strength of Democratic voters, SB 1200 operates to minimize or cancel out the votes of Democrats, solely because the dominant party in the State Legislature does not like their political point of view and how they vote. SB 1200 consistently and systematically degrades the influence of Democratic voters on the political process as a whole, denies them fair representation, and penalizes Democratic voters for their views. Given that Democratic voters make up a small majority of the voters in Pennsylvania, SB 1200 will frustrate the will of the majority to influence the political process.

35. The harms caused by SB 1200 go well beyond the statewide dilution of Democratic voting strength. SB 1200 dramatically affects the Democratic Party's prospects for success in congressional elections in Pennsylvania in other ways and will operate to reduce the choices that voters, and particularly Democratic voters, will have in Pennsylvania elections. Political success depends on a variety of factors, including party organizing, recruitment of viable candidates, fund-raising, and voter turnout efforts. These factors, in turn, depend in large part on the party's potential for success. Because of the bias created by SB 1200, the Democratic Party will have greater difficulty in fielding competitive candidates. Further, those candidates who do run will find it more difficult to raise the money necessary to compete effectively, because potential donors will be hesitant to support losing candidates.

36. By locking down control of the congressional delegation, Republicans have leveraged their control over other aspects of the Pennsylvania political structure to essentially shut Democrats and Democratic voters out of the political process. Republicans already control the General Assembly and the Governor's office; SB 1200 itself is evidence that they will use that political power to minimize the voice of Democratic voters so that they might advance the Republican agenda in Pennsylvania and in national politics. SB 1200 installs the Republican Party as the dominant party in Pennsylvania – based solely on bias and unfairness, not on votes.

37. Democratic voters, such as plaintiffs, will also suffer harm due to the impact of SB 1200 on representation of Pennsylvania voters. The fact that 13 or 14 districts are now designated as "Republican districts" means that

Pennsylvania Democrats – who compose a majority of the state – will now be increasingly represented by members of Congress who do not represent their views. As with race, when a district – indeed an entire state's redistricting plan is obviously created solely to effectuate the interests of one political group, elected officials are more likely to believe that their primary obligation is to represent only the members of that group, rather than the constituency as a whole. Indeed, the presumption that a winning candidate represents all of the district's constituents is not as strong here as it is in the case of a racial gerrymander, where there is no necessary connection between a voter's or candidate's race and his or her political views. In a partisan case, the presumption no longer holds, because the connection between one's partisan affiliation and his or her political views is much closer than the connection between a voter's race and his or her political views. Even those voters whose political views do not perfectly correlate with their representatives' views are better represented by a representative of their own political party than one of another party. Although representatives may still be responsive to the interests of independent voters whose vote they may aim to capture, they are non-responsive to – and can entirely ignore – voters who support the opposing party.

38. SB 1200 also harms plaintiffs and other Democratic voters in Pennsylvania because it clearly and improperly draws distinctions and doles out benefits on the basis of political party. Unlike a redistricting plan that seeks to balance partisan success between the two parties or one which takes politics into account, SB 1200 creates favored and disfavored groups, and sends a clear message to the people of Pennsylvania – electing Republicans is more important than the will of the majority and Democrats are to

be penalized because their views are not favored by the majority in the General Assembly. By relying exclusively on a principle of maximum partisan advantage, the General Assembly's plan thus classifies and discriminates against voters solely because of their party affiliations. Plaintiffs' ability to associate with other Democratic voters to support their candidate of choice has been uniquely harmed, not by any accident of geography, but by an intentional effort to degrade a class of voters' ability to influence the political process.

39. SB 1200 also harms Democratic voters in the Commonwealth because it is, on its face and intentionally, legislation that exults Republican advantage over any legitimate criterion for governmental decisionmaking. Classifications based on political affiliation, like those based on race, are ordinarily impermissible, but the Supreme Court has indicated that such classifications may be permitted when drawing districts. In the line of cases that started with *Shaw v. Reno*, 509 U.S. 630 (1993), the Supreme Court recognized that even a factor that might otherwise be permissible can render a plan unconstitutional when used to the exclusion of all other criteria. The problem is not that the General Assembly considered politics, but that it subordinated – indeed ignored – all traditional redistricting principles and all legitimate bases for governmental decisionmaking, in order to favor those with one political viewpoint over another, thus implicating fundamental rights protected by the U.S. and Pennsylvania Constitutions. SB 1200 is so irregular on its face that it rationally can be viewed only as an effort to segregate voters to advance the interests of one political party, without regard for traditional redistricting principles and without any legitimate or compelling justification.

40. The very fact that the General Assembly has subordinated all legitimate criteria to political preference is itself a violation of the Equal Protection Clause. While politics will always plan an important role in redistricting, this was not politics as usual. The General Assembly's plan has exceeded ordinary politics, and thus requires judicial intervention. It will impose serious handicaps on Pennsylvania Democrats' efforts to participate in the political process and leaves Pennsylvania Democrats shut out of the congressional electoral process.

CLAIM I

41. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference Paragraphs 1 through 40.

42. The facts herein alleged constitute a denial or abridgement of the plaintiffs' right to vote for their Representative to the United States Congress, in violation of Section 2 of Article I of the United States Constitution, as amended by Section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment, and Section 4, Article I of the United States Constitution.

CLAIM II

43. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference Paragraphs 1 through 42.

44. The facts herein alleged constitute a denial to the plaintiffs of the equal protection of the laws as guaranteed to them by the Equal Protection Clause of Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

CLAIM III

45. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference Paragraphs 1 through 44.

46. The facts herein alleged constitute an abridgement of the privileges and immunities of citizenship guaranteed to the plaintiffs by the Privileges or Immunities Clause of Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

CLAIM IV

47. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference Paragraphs 1 through 46.

48. The facts herein alleged constitute a denial or abridgement of the plaintiffs' right to free association as guaranteed to them by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution.

CLAIM V

49. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference Paragraphs 1 through 48.

50. The facts herein alleged constitute a violation of Section 1983 of Title 42 of the United States Code.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, plaintiffs respectfully pray that this Court:

A. Assume jurisdiction of this matter and convene as a three-judge District Court pursuant to Section 2284 of Title 28 of the United States Code;

B. Enter a declaratory judgment that the congressional districting plan that the General Assembly passed on January 3, 2002 violates plaintiffs' rights under the aforesaid provisions of the United States Constitution and federal law;

C. Enjoin permanently the defendants, their officers, agents, employees, attorneys, successors in office, from conducting primary or general elections, by themselves or in concert with other persons, using the January 3, 2002 General Assembly congressional districting plan or any other congressional districting plan that violates the United States Constitution or federal law;

D. Impose by Court order a new congressional redistricting plan that meets the requirements of the United States Constitution and federal law that will be in effect for the 2002 elections and enjoin the defendants from enacting or implementing a new redistricting plan until the 2004 elections;

E. Grant plaintiffs their reasonable attorneys' fees, litigation expenses, and court costs; and

F. Grant plaintiffs any other relief that the Court finds appropriate and equitable.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Daniel T. Brier, Esquire
Donna A. Walsh, Esquire
MYERS, BRIER & KELLY, L.L.P.
Suite 200, 425 Spruce Street
Scranton, PA 18503
(570) 342-6100

Paul M. Smith
Thomas J. Perrelli
Daniel Mach
Brian P. Hauck
JENNER & BLOCK, LLC
601 Thirteenth Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 639-6000

Attorneys for Plaintiffs Richard Vieth, Norma Jean Vieth, and Susan Furey

Dated: January 11, 2002

Appendix G

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

RICHARD VIETH, NORMA JEAN VIETH, and SUSAN FUREY,	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
v.	)	No.1: CV 01-2439
	)	Judge Rambo,
THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA; MARK S. SCHWEIKER, et al	)	Judge Yohn, Judge Nygaard
Defendants.	)	

DECLARATION OF ROBERT L. PRIEST

I, Robert L. Priest, declare and state as follows:

1. I am the Technical Director of the Office of Demographic Analysis for the Democratic Caucus of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives. I testified at the trial in this case.

2. I have analyzed Act 34, which was signed by the Governor on April 18, 2002, using the same techniques as those I testified to at trial.

3. South Buffalo Township has two election precincts – the Western Election District and the Eastern Election District. South Buffalo Township is one of many split municipalities in Act 34. Under the legal definition of Act 34, the Western Election District is in congressional district 3 and the Eastern Election District is in congressional district 12.

4. After the passage of Act 1, but before the passage of Act 34, the boundaries of the election districts in South Buffalo Township were modified. Press accounts indicate that this change was made with the support of two members of Congress, as well as at least one state legislator.

5. By order of the Court of Common Pleas of Armstrong County, the boundaries of the Western Election District and the Eastern Election District of South Buffalo Township were altered on March 15, 2002, by moving 4 census blocks from the Western Election District to the Eastern Election District. Those four census blocks contain 49 people.

6. Thus, District 3 in Act 34 has a population of 646,323. District 12 under Act 34 has a population of 646,420. The population deviation of Act 34 is therefore 97.

7. Act 34 splits 2 precincts, one in Boggs Township and one in Oliver Township. In each case, the precinct splits serve to connect otherwise discontiguous districts. The Boggs Township precinct is split between Districts 5 and 9 in an effort to connect a discontiguous piece of Knox Township. The Oliver Township precinct is split between Districts 9 and 17 in order to connect a piece of Newport Borough with the rest of its district. I created an exhibit that

sets forth the county, municipal, and precinct splits in Act 34 which is attached hereto as Exhibit 1.

8. Act 34 splits more counties and municipalities than Act 1. Act 34 splits 29 counties (up from 25 in Act 1) and splits 81 municipalities (up from 65 in Act 1. See Ex. 1 hereto.

9. Act 34 is also less compact on average than Act 1. I used the Autobound software package to analyze the compactness of the congressional districts created by Act 34, the same software package which I used to analyze the compactness of Act 1's districts and which I testified about at trial. The nine compactness scores for Act 34 are attached hereto as Exhibit 2.

10. One can compare Act 34 and Act 1 by calculating the percentage of population in each of Act 1's districts that are carried over into Act 34. The following are the percentage of each of Act 34's districts (by population) that derive from the corresponding districts in Act 1: District 1, 99.54%; District 2, 99.83%; District 3, 99.64%; District 4, 99.31%; District 5, 99.31%; District 6, 97.81%; District 7, 99.83%; District 8, 100.00%; District 9, 97.99%; District 10, 99.90%; District 11, 100.00%; District 12, 99.50%; District 13, 99.50%; District 14, 99.77%; District 15, 99.47%; District 16, 98.72%; District 17, 98.67%; District 18, 99.11%; District 19, 99.42%. I created an exhibit that summarizes this analysis, which is attached hereto as Exhibit 3.

11. After this Court's ruling striking down Act 1, the Pennsylvania House and Senate each passed a modified version of Act 1 with congressional districts that were

discontiguous in 4 places. Three of those discontiguous districts were corrected, but one remains in Act 34. Under Act 34, a portion of Birmingham Township in District 16 is wholly encompassed by District 7 and the State line, at no point connected to the rest of District 16. I have now reviewed Act 1 again and it suffered from the same problem.

I affirm under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

/s/ Robert L. Priest
Robert L. Priest

April 21, 2002

Exhibit 1

HB 2545 Amendment A1462
U.S. Congressional

Split Counties (29)	County Splits (42)	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Allegheny	4	12	14	18		
	Armstrong	3	12				
	Beaver	4	18				
	Berks	6	15	16	17		
	Butler	3	4				
	Cambria	9	12				
	Chester	6	7	16			
	Clearfield	5	9				
	Crawford	3	5				
	Cumberland	9	19				
	Delaware	1	7				
	Fayette	9	12				
	Indiana	9	12				
	Juniata	5	9				
	Lackawanna	10	11				
	Lehigh	6	15				
	Luzerne	10	11				
	Lycoming	5	10				

	Mercer	3	4				
	Miffin	5	9				
	Montgomery	2	6	7	8	13	
	Perry	9	17				
	Philadelphia	1	2	8	13		15
	Somerset	9	12				
	Tioga	5	10				
	Venango	3	5				
	Warren	3	5				
	Washington	12	18				
	Westmoreland	4	9	12	18		

HB 2545 Amendment A1462
U.S. Congressional

Split
Municipalities (81) Municipal Splits (84)

County	Municipality	1	2	3	4
Allegheny	Avalon Borough	4	14		
Allegheny	East Deer Twp	4	12		
Allegheny	Etna Borough	4	14		
Allegheny	Forward Twp	12	18		
Allegheny	Neville Twp	4	14		
Allegheny	O'Hara Twp	4	14		
Allegheny	Baldwin Borough	14	18		
Allegheny	Crafton Borough	14	18		
Allegheny	Elizabeth Twp	14	18		
Allegheny	Monroeville Borough	14	18		
Allegheny	North Versailles Twp	14	18		
Allegheny	Penn Hills Twp	14	18		
Allegheny	Pitcairn Borough	14	18		
Allegheny	Robinson Twp	14	18		
Allegheny	White Oak Borough	14	18		
Allegheny	Wilkins Twp	14	18		
Armstrong	North Buffalo Twp	3	12		
Armstrong	South Buffalo Twp	3	12		

Beaver	Hanover Twp	4	18		
Berks	Bern Twp	16	17		
Berks	Earl Twp	6	17		
Berks	Hereford Twp	6	15		
Berks	Muhlenberg Twp	6	16	17	
Berks	Reading City	6	16		
Berks	South Heidelberg Twp	6	16		
Berks	Spring Twp	6	16		
Cambria	Susquehanna Twp	9	12		
Chester	East Bradford Twp	6	16		
Chester	Phoenixville Borough	6	7		
Clearfield	Beccaria Twp	5	9		
Clearfield	Boggs Twp	5	9		
Cumberland	Dickinson	9	19		
Cumberland	Middlesex Twp	9	19		
Cumberland	Southampton Twp	9	19		
Cumberland	West Pennsboro Twp	9	19		
Delaware	Darby Twp	1	7		
Delaware	Ridley Twp	1	7		
Delaware	Tinicum Twp	1	7		
Fayette	Connellsville City	9	12		
Fayette	Dunbar Twp	9	12		

Fayette	Georges Twp	9	12		
Fayette	Nicholson Twp	9	12		
Fayette	North Union Twp	9	12		
Fayette	South Union Twp	9	12		
Fayette	Springhill Twp	9	12		
Indiana	Indiana Borough	9	12		
Indiana	White Twp	9	12		
Lackawanna	Dickson City Borough	10	11		
Lackawanna	Jessup Borough	10	11		
Lackawanna	Olyphant Borough	10	11		
Lehigh	Upper Macungie	6	15		
Luzerne	Swoyersville Borough	10	11		
Mercer	Hermitage City	3	4		
Montgomery	Abington Twp	8	13		
Montgomery	Conshohocken Borough	6	7		
Montgomery	Plymouth Twp	6	13		
Montgomery	Upper Dublin Twp	8	13		
Montgomery	Upper Hanover Twp	13	15		
Montgomery	Upper Moreland Twp	8	13		
Montgomery	Whitemarsh Twp	6	13		
Montgomery	Whitpain Twp	6	13		
Perry	Newport Borough	9	17		

Perry	Oliver Twp	9	17		
Philadelphia	Philadelphia City	1	2	8	13
Washington	Canonsburg Borough	12	18		
Washington	Carroll Twp	12	18		
Washington	Charleroi Borough	12	18		
Washington	Chartiers Twp	12	18		
Washington	East Washington Borough	12	18		
Washington	Fallowfield Twp	12	18		
Washington	North Strabane Twp	12	18		
Washington	South Strabane Twp	12	18		
Westmoreland	Derry Twp	9	12		
Westmoreland	East Huntingdon Twp	12	18		
Westmoreland	Hempfield Twp	12	18		
Westmoreland	Mount Pleasant Twp	12	18		
Westmoreland	Salem Twp	12	18		
Westmoreland	Sewickley Twp	12	18		
Westmoreland	South Huntingdon Twp	12	18		
Westmoreland	Unity Twp	12	18		
Westmoreland	Washington Twp	12	18		

Precinct Splits (2)

County	Precinct	1	2		

Clearfield	Boggs Twp	5	9		
Perry	Oliver Twp	9	17		

Ward (47)

Exhibit 2

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Area	Perimeter	Equalarea
01	0.140	0.427	0.140	0.065	0.255	0.375	0.017	0.131	0.121	0.018	1.888	0.255
02	0.432	0.657	0.440	0.163	0.403	0.657	0.082	0.286	0.190	0.016	1.128	0.402
03	0.412	0.599	0.412	0.145	0.381	0.641	0.143	0.379	0.349	1.336	10.753	0.381
04	0.296	0.692	0.296	0.225	0.474	0.544	0.105	0.325	0.357	0.364	4.516	0.474
05	0.377	0.836	0.377	0.190	0.436	0.614	0.155	0.394	0.411	3.097	14.316	0.436
06	0.328	0.546	0.328	0.079	0.281	0.572	0.081	0.285	0.249	0.224	5.978	0.281
07	0.507	0.686	0.554	0.166	0.407	0.712	0.189	0.434	0.372	0.080	2.467	0.407
08	0.340	0.785	0.340	0.319	0.565	0.583	0.129	0.359	0.380	0.174	2.619	0.565
09	0.265	0.693	0.265	0.099	0.314	0.515	0.104	0.322	0.391	1.973	15.876	0.314
10	0.314	0.687	0.314	0.161	0.401	0.560	0.069	0.262	0.219	1.860	12.059	0.401
11	0.283	0.712	0.283	0.243	0.493	0.532	0.068	0.260	0.239	0.624	5.681	0.493
12	0.217	0.537	0.217	0.047	0.216	0.466	0.023	0.153	0.108	0.762	14.343	0.216
13	0.192	0.594	0.192	0.093	0.306	0.438	0.033	0.182	0.173	0.071	3.083	0.305
14	0.303	0.689	0.303	0.090	0.300	0.550	0.079	0.280	0.260	0.047	2.549	0.300
15	0.309	0.584	0.313	0.178	0.422	0.556	0.114	0.338	0.370	0.235	4.066	0.422
16	0.332	0.722	0.332	0.216	0.465	0.576	0.153	0.391	0.460	0.362	4.599	0.464
17	0.289	0.723	0.289	0.233	0.482	0.538	0.091	0.302	0.316	0.655	5.950	0.482
18	0.230	0.568	0.236	0.055	0.235	0.479	0.033	0.181	0.143	0.394	9.474	0.235
19	0.323	0.838	0.323	0.348	0.590	0.568	0.154	0.393	0.478	0.455	4.052	0.590

Exhibit 3

HB2545 Act 1 TOTPOP

1 1 1 1 Total	1 Total 2 Total 13 Total	643,426 1,087 1,858 646,371	99.54%
2 2 2 Total	1 Total 2 Total	1,097 645,274 646,371	99.83%
3 3 3 Total	3 Total 12 Total	644,539 1,833 646,372	99.72%
4 4 4 4 Total	3 Total 4 Total 14 Total	1,825 644,032 514 646,371	99.64%
5 5 5 5 Total	5 Total 9 Total 10 Total	641,897 3,849 625 646,371	99.31%

6 6 6 6 6 6 6 Total	6 Total 7 Total 13 Total 15 Total 16 Total 17 Total	632,208 1,121 1,240 2,181 8,207 1,414 646,371	97.81%
7 7 7 Total	6 Total 7 Total	1,113 645,259 646,372	99.83%
8 8 Total	8 Total	646,371 646,371	100.00 %
9 9 9 9 9 9 Total	5 Total 9 Total 12 Total 17 Total 19 Total	3,852 633,408 1,576 3,130 4,406 646,372	97.99%
10 10 10 Total	5 Total 10 Total	622 645,749 646,371	99.90%

11 11 Total	11 Total	646,372 646,372	100.00 %
12 12 12 12 Total	9 Total 12 Total 18 Total	1,483 640,822 4,066 646,371	99.14%
13 13 13 13 Total	1 Total 13 Total 15 Total	1,838 643,158 1,376 646,372	99.50%
14 14 14 Total	14 Total 18 Total	644,887 1,484 646,371	99.77%
15 15 15 15 Total	6 Total 15 Total 17 Total	1,771 642,938 1,662 646,371	99.47%
16 16 16 16 Total	6 Total 16 Total 17 Total	5,888 638,114 2,369 646,371	98.72%

17 17 17 17 Total	6 total 9 Total 17 Total	5,442 3,143 637,786 646,371	98.67%
18 18 18 18 18 Total	4 Total 12 Total 14 Total 18 Total	2,390 2,358 977 640,646 646,371	99.11%
19 19 19 Total	9 Total 19 Total	3,730 642,641 646,371	99.42%

APPENDIX H

U. S. Congressional Districts - Act 34



BEST AVAILABLE COPY

APPENDIX I


U. S. Congressional Districts - Southeast - Act 34
Berks
17
15
13
Montgomery
6
Chester
Philadelphia
7
Delaware
1

APPENDIX J

U. S. Congressional Districts - Southwest - Act 34

